# U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

+ + + + +

## STRIVING READERS COMPREHENSIVE

## LITERACY PROGRAM

# STATE GRANT COMPETITION DEVELOPMENT

+ + + + +

# PUBLIC AND EXPERT INPUT MEETING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY

NOVEMBER 19, 2010

+ + + + +

The meeting convened, in the PCP Auditorium, Potomac Center Plaza, 550 12th Street S.W., Washington, D.C., at 9:00 a.m., Deborah Spitz, U.S. Department of Education, presiding.

PRESENT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

DEBORAH SPITZ, Group Leader, Early Childhood

and Reading Group, Office of Elementary and

Secondary Education

CARL HARRIS, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and State Technical Assistance,
Office of Elementary and Secondary
Education

THELMA MELENDEZ DE SANTA ANA, Assistant Secretary, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

JACQUELINE JONES, Senior Advisor to the Secretary for Early Learning

MICHAEL YUDIN, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

EXPERT PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT

MICHAEL KAMIL, Consulting Professor of Education, Stanford University

NONIE LESAUX, Associate Professor in Human Development and Urban Education Advancement, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University

PAIGE PULLEN, Associate Professor, Curry

School of Education

JILL SLACK, Director of Literacy, Louisiana
Department of Education

DOROTHY STRICKLAND, Professor Emerita,
Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey

WYNNE TYE, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction, Hillsborough

County Public Schools

	Page 3
C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S	
Call to Order and Opening Remarks	8
Deborah Spitz	O
Group Leader	
Early Childhood and Reading Group	
Office of Elementary and Secondary	
Education	
U.S. Department of Education	
o.b. Deparement of Badeaeron	
Welcome and Introductions	11
Dr. Thelma Melendez de Santa Ana	
Assistant Secretary	
Office of Elementary and Secondary	
Education	
U.S. Department of Education	
Deborah Spitz	13
Group Leader	
Early Childhood and Reading Group	
Office of Elementary and Secondary	
Education	
U.S. Department of Education	
Expert Panel - Professional Development,	18
Instruction and Assessment; Evidence	
and Evaluation; Transition and Alignment	
across Birth through Grade 12, and	
Meeting the Needs of Diverse Learners	1.0
Facilitator:	18
Dr. Thelma Melendez de Santa Ana	
Assistant Secretary	
Office of Elementary and Secondary	
Education	
U.S. Department of Education	
Panelists:	
Dr. Dorothy Strickland	24
Professor Emerita	
Rutgers, the State University	
of New Jersey	
<b>-</b>	

			Page 4
C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S (CONTINUED)			
Panelists (continued):			
Dr. Michael Kamil		44	
Consulting Professor of Education			
Stanford University			
Dr. Nonie Lesaux		66	
Associate Professor in Human			
Development and Urban Education			
Advancement			
Graduate School of Education			
Harvard University			
Questions	89,	125	
Public Speakers		102	
Stuart Greenberg		102	
Florida Department of Education			
Jennifer Weber		107	
Nemours			
Margie Gillis		113	
Haskins Laboratories			
w'sharing and		110	
Michael Cesarano		118	
Houghton Mifflin Harcourt			
Sharon Landesman Ramey		120	
Georgetown University		120	
George cowin onliversity			
Thank you and Conclusion		135	
Deborah Spitz			
Group Leader			
Early Childhood and Reading Group			
Office of Elementary and Secondary			
Education			
U.S. Department of Education			
o.b. Deparement of Education			

	Page 5
C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S (CONTINUED)	
Afternoon Session	137
Welcome and Introduction  Deborah Spitz  Group Leader  Early Childhood and Reading Group	137 137
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education U.S. Department of Education	
Dr. Carl Harris  Deputy Assistant Secretary for  Policy and State Technical Assistance  Office of Elementary and Secondary  Education  U.S. Department of Education	140
Overview of Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy Program Deborah Spitz Group Leader Early Childhood and Reading Group Office of Elementary and Secondary	142
Education U.S. Department of Education Expert Panel - SEA and LEA Capacity and Support; and Meeting the Needs of Diverse Learners	147
Facilitator:	147
Dr. Carl Harris Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and State Technical Assistance Office of Elementary and Secondary Education	
U.S. Department of Education	

	Page 6	5
C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S (CONTINUED)		
Panelists:		
Dr. Paige Pullen Associate Professor	154	
Curry School of Education		
Dr. Jill Slack	175	
Director of Literacy		
Louisiana Department of Education		
We was a Trans	100	
Wynne Tye Assistant Superintendent of	192	
Curriculum and Instruction		
Hillsborough County Public Schools		
Questions	209	
Public Speakers	231	
T. F. F. W	221	
Jeff Kratz American Library Association	231	
Ginny Cooper	235	
State Librarian	233	
District of Columbia		
Daniella Gratale	240	
Nemours		
Mindy Larson	246	
Institute for Educational Leadership		
Lucy Gettman	252	
Director of Federal Programs		
National School Boards Association		
Laura Meadows	258	
Captions for Literacy		

Page 7 C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S (CONTINUED) Public Speakers (Continued) Ellen Schiller 262 SRI International Micki Freeny 265 District of Columbia Public Library

## P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2 9:09 a.m.

MS. SPITZ: (Presiding) Good

4 morning, everyone.

We had wanted to start exactly at 9:00, but, of course, these things never go quite the way you expect them to. So, we are starting; it's 9:10.

And thank you for being here. We have a very busy morning and a busy day for those of you who wish to stay for the whole day. But you will hear a lot more about what the day is going to consist of. Also, all the handouts are outside at the table.

My name is Deborah Spitz. I
manage a group of reading programs at the
Department of Education in the Department's
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.

This morning I am going to introduce our facilitator for this morning's panel.

And again, if you need anything,

the folks at the table from Synergy will be happy to help you.

So, our facilitator for today, I am very pleased to introduce Dr. Thelma

Melendez de Santa Ana. She is our Assistant

Secretary of the Elementary and Secondary

Education Office at the Department. She has been there since July 2009. You may imagine this is a critical role at the Department, especially right now with reauthorization in process.

Dr. Melendez serves as the policy advisor to the Secretary on all things relating to early learning, elementary and secondary education. She is fostering educational improvement at the state and local levels throughout the nation through her management of programs like Title I, but a number of others as well.

Prior to coming to the Department,

Dr. Melendez served as the Superintendent of
the Pomona District Unified School District in

Southern California. This is a District that served 31,000 students, three-quarters of whom are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch and 44 percent were English language learners. She was responsible for the three highest increases in the academic proficiency index in the District's history.

In 2009, she was selected by the American Association of School Administrators as California Superintendent of the Year, and she has also received a number of other honors, including a 2007 award for Latina of Excellence by Hispanic Magazine.

In 2005, she was recognized as an Outstanding K-to-12 School Leader and Distinguished Partner for Educational Excellence.

And in 2003, she was named

Outstanding Educator of the Year by the LA

County Bilingual Directors' Association. And
there's others as well, and we have a detailed
bio for you.

Dr. Melendez earned her Ph.D. from 1 2 the University of Southern California, 3 specializing in language, literacy, and 4 learning. 5 So, we are really pleased, both 6 I'm pleased to work for her at the Department 7 and we are very pleased to have her 8 facilitating this morning's discussion. 9 DR. MELENDEZ DE SANTA ANA: Thank 10 you, Deborah. 11 Can you all hear me? No? Is the 12 microphone on? I don't think the microphone 13 Is it on now? I'll use my principal's is on. 14 voice. How's that? 15 (Laughter.) 16 Does that work? Can you hear me? 17 Okay. 18 I just want to welcome all of you 19 It is sort of a real privilege to be today. 20 able to facilitate this distinguished panel 21 today. 22 I know it is taking time out of

your day, but, for us at the Department, it is extremely important that we receive and hear input from you and that we are able to develop a grant competition that reflects what the public feels and what the public feels is important, as well as what experts say is important.

So, to help us in this discussion, we have a wide range of experts who are here to discuss literacy as it relates to a variety of different priorities, including increasing the achievement of English learners and students with disabilities.

I also look forward to hearing your insight, your ideas, and your feedback about this important program.

I would like to start off by asking Deborah to come back up and to take us through the actual grant itself and the Striving Leaders Comprehensive Literacy, so we have sort of an understanding of what the grant is about and what the purpose of this

1 meeting is about as well.

MS. SPITZ: I am going to go through this very briefly, actually. You have the handout.

We get a lot of questions about this program. It is very new and it is somewhat complicated. So, we do get questions, and you can always call our office. There will be contact information at the end, and you can ask us questions about this program.

But we wanted to give you a basic written-out line of what the key parts of the program are. So, I will go through this quickly because we have some great people for you to hear from today.

So, Striving Leaders Comprehensive Literacy is a different program for us in a couple of ways. One is that it does serve birth to grade 12. That is very different for us.

The other is that it is kind of

this two-part program in that it has a small formula component and a large competitive grant component. All of the funds will go to states, and states will, then, make awards to districts.

Everything I am going to discuss very briefly or everything that is in the PowerPoints is actually from statutory language.

This program was created by

Congress in the FY2010 Appropriations Act.

So, these are some details about funding,
which you can read on your own. Basically, we
just made small awards to all the states,
well, most of the states that applied. These
are formula awards. They were roughly, for
most states, they were \$150,000. So, that is
a small amount of money, but that is enough
for states to get started. It is either for
them to enhance existing state literacy teams
or to build new state literacy teams, and
again, to enhance or create state literacy

1 plans.

Again, these plans need to cover birth to grade 12. They need to cover students who are English language learners and students with disabilities.

So, some states, a lot of states have comprehensive literacy plans, but they may not be as comprehensive as this program.

So, these funds will support that.

For the competitive program, which I think is probably why you are here, we will be holding a competition in the spring. The eligible entities will be SEAs, or State Education Agencies.

The states that did receive

funding under this program -- and we don't

know how many states will receive funding

under this program. It depends who wins and

how large those states are. Then, they have

to make subgrant awards to school districts or

basically LEAs or early learning providers -
and we will talk about that a little bit more

1 -- to fund services that have the

2 characteristics of effective literacy

3 instruction in these components: professional

4 development, screening and assessment,

5 targeted intervention, and other research-

6 based methods of improving classroom

7 instruction.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Again, this is statutory language, so this is our mission, but this isn't language that we are flexible on. This is our statutory language.

So, this is a key part of the program. This is the breakdown of how states that win these funds will have to use the funds. Again, this is in statute.

So, it is up to 5 percent for state leadership activities, and those are administrative functions, evaluation, technical assistance. And then, the breakouts by age. So, it's up to 15 percent for birth to pre-K, 40 percent for grades K to five, 40 percent for grades six to twelve, with

equitable distribution between middle and high school.

And states have very different ways of doing middle and high school. So, that will be something that states will have to figure out, you know, what that distribution is.

This is the definition of who is eligible, and I am not going to read this to you. Again, this is statutory language, and it is a little bit lengthy.

What this says is that eligible entities, because we know that a lot of early learning providers are not LEAs, there is this provision to allow for other type of entities to apply for funding to the state. But this is a lengthy description, and I will let you read that on your own.

And this is basically our timeline. We just awarded the formula funds. That means states are all developing their comprehensive literacy plans. They can use

whatever they have developed in terms of applying for the competitive grants, if they wish. We hope to publish a notice inviting applications January to February, and that all depends mostly on our clearance process.

So, we are here today to get your input as we develop the NIA. Once we have gotten your input and processed all of it, we will put an NIA into clearance, and then we go through that process.

So, we generally provide, we hope to provide basically a 60-day window for states to apply. Then, we do our peer review process and make our grant awards, hopefully, by August 2011.

And with that, I will turn it back over to Dr. Melendez.

DR. MELENDEZ DE SANTA ANA: Let me go through the agenda quickly.

First of all, we have just gone through the welcome and setting the stage. In just a few minutes, we will have expert

presentations from our panelists. During that time, the expert guests will each discuss pertinent areas to the grant.

The presentations will be followed by a short discussion with our expert panel and the Department of Education staff members who are seated here.

Afterwards, we will open it up to public speakers, and those of you who have already signed up know what number you are.

This will be an opportunity for members of the public who have registered. But, also, if you have not registered and would like to, you can go over to the table outside and register.

There is still time, if you would like.

Okay. Let's go through some goals and some norms for this input meeting.

Deborah showed a little bit about what is important.

First of all, this is a meeting to develop our Notice Inviting Applications.

That requires states to develop high-quality

proposals that will result in the increase in student achievement.

One way to develop, as Deborah described, is by providing time for the public to give input to the program. This is extremely important for us, and we really look forward to hearing from you.

We also hope that this meeting will paint a picture or sort of a vision of what a comprehensive literacy program could and should be, and what it should look like, both at the state and local levels.

This meeting is an opportunity for Department of Education staff to receive expert and public guidance in response to the questions that were asked in the notice.

A few more brief points to set expectations for this meeting:

First of all, we are on a tight schedule, and we started a little late.

Since, again, we want to maximize time for public input, we will be keeping very close

tabs on time. So there is a group here that is helping us to maintain our schedule. So, you will see them holding up signs that give us warning of time.

And just one last reminder:

please, if you have a cell phone, if you could

put it on vibrate, that would be very helpful.

We don't want to have any distractions while

our speakers are presenting. We owe them the

courtesy of that.

Okay. This is your handout. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us.

Let me start off with just mentioning who we are going to have today as part of our panel.

We have Michael Kamil, who is a Consulting Professor from Stanford University, School of Education.

We have Dorothy Strickland,
Professor Emerita and Distinguished Research
Fellow from the National Institute for Early

Education Research from Rutgers State
University of New Jersey.

Graduate School of Education.

And we have Nonie Lesaux,

Associate Professor of Human Development and

Urban Education Advancement at the Harvard

And these will be our panelists this morning. We will have three panelists in the afternoon session as well.

Okay. So, let me start off by also introducing, you've already met Deborah, but also introducing Michael Yudin, who is the Deputy Assistant Secretary in the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.

And so, Education staff, then, at the end of the three presentations, will ask questions of our panelists. We might have time for maybe two or three questions, but we wanted to have that opportunity to do that.

Okay. So, let me start off by introducing our first speaker. That is Professor Dorothy Strickland.

1	Professor Strickland is the Samuel
2	DeWitt Proctor Professor of Education Emerita,
3	as I mentioned, from Rutgers I always
4	mispronounce it; I think it is my English
5	language background (Laughter) Rutgers
6	State University of New Jersey, a former
7	classroom teacher, reading consultant,
8	learning disabilities specialist. She is a
9	Past President of both the International
10	Reading Association and the Reading Hall of
11	Fame.
12	She received IRA's Outstanding
12	She received IRA's Outstanding Teacher Educator of Reading Award, the
13	Teacher Educator of Reading Award, the
13 14	Teacher Educator of Reading Award, the  National Council of Teachers of English Award,
13 14 15	Teacher Educator of Reading Award, the  National Council of Teachers of English Award,  as Outstanding Educator in the Language Arts,
13 14 15 16	Teacher Educator of Reading Award, the  National Council of Teachers of English Award,  as Outstanding Educator in the Language Arts,  and the National-Louis University Ferguson
13 14 15 16	Teacher Educator of Reading Award, the  National Council of Teachers of English Award, as Outstanding Educator in the Language Arts, and the National-Louis University Ferguson  Award for Outstanding Contributions to Early
13 14 15 16	Teacher Educator of Reading Award, the  National Council of Teachers of English Award, as Outstanding Educator in the Language Arts, and the National-Louis University Ferguson  Award for Outstanding Contributions to Early Childhood Education.
13 14 15 16 17	Teacher Educator of Reading Award, the  National Council of Teachers of English Award, as Outstanding Educator in the Language Arts, and the National-Louis University Ferguson  Award for Outstanding Contributions to Early  Childhood Education.  She was invited to give the 2008

National Academy of Sciences Committee on 1 2 Teacher Education, authorized by Congress, and 3 the National Early Literacy Panel. She is a member of the panels that 4 5 produced Becoming a Nation of Readers, 6 Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young 7 Children, and the RAND Report, "Reading for 8 Understanding". Her latest publications 9 include "Literacy Leadership in Early Childhood, Learning about Print in Preschool 10 Settings", "Bridging the Literacy Achievement 11 12 Gap 4-12", and "The Administration and 13 Supervision of Reading Programs". 14 She is a member of the New Jersey State Board of Education. 15 16 It is my pleasure to introduce Professor Strickland. 17 Thank you. 18 DR. STRICKLAND: 19 you very much. 20 I hope that long introduction 21 won't be taken off of my 20 minutes. 22 (Laughter.)

Good morning, everyone. I'm delighted to be here.

I think this is a very important topic, an important project. I am thrilled to see that it is expanded to include the earliest years right through high school. And yet, I think it is going to be a daunting task to do that, and to do it well.

I am going to move on. As an overview, my feeling and my approach about this whole effort is that it truly is comprehensive -- and that word has been used many times already this morning -- and coordinated, and it is going to be really important for the grantees' program of prevention and intervention.

So, I think the prevention part is really something that we will be focusing on during those very early years and beyond, and across all levels and points of instruction and involvement.

And I have organized my remarks

around that intersection, those places where we will be focusing on the instruction and involvement, state level, LEAs, school, and early childhood centers, classroom, and the Striving Readers Program.

First, what are some of the key considerations that ought to be addressed in these grant proposals? Certainly, articulation across all levels of education, birth through high school. These would be some of the things that I would look for. You know, a deliberate plan that includes that kind of articulation.

And special, a new emphasis on early childhood literacy development. This is new, and I think that, as I said before, it will be a challenge to make this all work.

Interestingly enough, exactly one year ago today, November 19th, 2009, I testified before the House Education and Labor Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary and Secondary Education. And they asked me to

focus my testimony on zero to 5. I am going to hit some of the highlights of that talk right now very, very quickly.

I addressed three questions and then talked a little bit about my work as an evaluator of Early Reading First. But, first, the importance of early literacy development, and key ideas here are that literacy learning starts early and persists throughout life.

From the earliest years,
everything we do counts. That is an important
message to get across. It's a big, big
message and one that people don't often think
about in terms of literacy with a very young
child.

Oral language and literacy develop concurrently. What children learn about oral language and what they do with oral language affects literacy. Oral language is foundational; no question about it. But there is that interdependence, that interplay between the two that is so important.

A second one was, what is needed to support young children's language and literacy development? Here is where that intersect between parents, teachers, caregivers, all of those people need to be mentioned and addressed as well as the policy people and the administrators at all points along the way.

There is a lot that we can do to improve what we're doing right now, certainly, with standards that reflect a shared view of where we're headed, a shared vision. And that is sometimes difficult because there is resistance, especially on the part of early childhood people, to join the rest of the gang, quite frankly, because we're busy protecting children from those people at the upper-grade level.

So, this is going to be kind of nuanced, but also deliberate that we work together. I think we can do it.

And I think that it is important

that the family be involved at these early levels and beyond those early levels, not just with young children.

Differentiated instruction, I will say that more than once in this brief talk.

Differentiation starts with a good organizational plan at the school level and the classroom level, and then teaching to targeted populations who might be among those driving readers and writers. You notice I am going to be talking about readers and writers, which is implied, indeed, but that is very important.

Certainly, struggling learners of all types, English learners, students with disabilities, and knowledge and respect for the cultural and linguistic diversity of these children, not only knowledge on the part of the teachers, but also that these things will be addressed.

And then, on articulation between the Striving Readers Program and regular

education. Too often, when new programs come in, they are ancillary. You know, they are parallel and they are not linked to the regular program.

I would look for evidence that people are addressing this not only in terms of programmatic issues, but also the personnel that are involved throughout.

Assessment: screening certainly from the earliest years and beyond as well.

And then, assessment that really is used to inform decisions. I would want to see evidence there that that assessment is not just going to be a group of numbers somewhere that is satisfied, but a deliberate plan for documentation in a variety of ways and, also, plans for what the assessment reveals and what we are going to do about it.

Strategic use of media technology, and I probably should have underlined "strategic", not just technology for its own sake, but technology that is used in a

purposeful way. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

This is so important. I am serving on a lot of committees that deal with technology, and I worry a great deal that sometimes the technology overwhelms the real purpose behind instruction and the goals. Technology is going to be an important part, I think, of anything that we do, but it needs to serve, not be served just for its own sake.

Ongoing professional development, and, here again, it is not a tack-on, but it is an embedded, integral part of the program itself.

And then, of course, the links. think there should be links to a variety of different organizations. The money in this grant I think, if I were to advocate, we up the money a lot, a whole lot.

I think that it is important that it is being done and that this money is being allocated, but there is just so much to do.

22 So, I think that it makes it even more

important that there be links to national, state, and local professional organizations. And I am thinking the ones that I know best, certainly, International Reading Association, the National Council of Teachers of English, in terms of professional organizations.

And certainly, at very young levels, Reach Out and Read, Reading Is
Fundamental, and Reading Is Fundamental
Beyond, those kinds of organizations that we have worked with before can have an impact here; other organizations as well, to be sure.
But I have a feeling that there is going to be a need for combined effort, and I would like to see that kind of thing as a part of a proposal.

Also, of course, attention to the research base. I know the others will talk about that even more, but I would like to see proposals that not only acknowledge that there is research behind the kinds of things they are advocating, but include some references to

that in the proposals.

At the state level, I would see
the use of those key components that I just
outlined, those 10 components, to guide,
review, and evaluate proposed plans. So,
there's got to be some basis for the decisions
that are made and how they are implemented.

And, of course, they would guide, monitor, and assess effective implementation of selected proposals. So, the state will be an important element in the overview and the guidance of the entire effort.

The state would establish and coordinate the state literacy team and a State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care. I know that that Advisory Council, I think those are in place already, but, again, they need to represent various aspects of the educational community.

And then, provide the leadership in linking the LEAs with relevant organizations, and I have mentioned some, but

others as well, to make sure that we are getting the best bang for our buck. I think this is going to be a real challenge for people. Why not use the resources that are there and willing and able?

District-level responsibilities:

again, that word "sustainability" I probably
should have put in red and very, very large
letters. I worry a great deal that we don't
put in place right from the beginning some
kind of systematic approach to keep this going
when the money isn't there anymore. It
shouldn't be something that is just added on,
and then when the money goes, it is abandoned.

It is some recognition that we have got to make this a part of the overall effort, so that it is sustainable. I would look very carefully at those qualities in any proposal.

So, again at the district level, providing leadership and support, linking all of those elements of education, standards,

1 curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

demonstrated part of the proposals.

Those are the key elements. They need to be linked together and that should be a

And again, providing leadership,

and I don't really need to go through that

again. But, again, at the local level, those

community-based organizations, any relevant

organizations I think should be a part of the

effort as well.

School-level responsibilities:

again, the focus on sustainability. This is
a serious, serious problem. I am afraid
sometimes that new programs, new initiatives
are looked at by some members of the school
community as just another burden, rather than
something that is there to support what they
are already doing.

So, some evidence that this has been considered and that there are links made not only through the organizational process that is in place, but through the professional

development. So that, the professional development is not just for those few people that are directly responsible for this program, but professional development for everyone who is responsible for the literacy development of these children, whether or not they are struggling readers and writers.

I mean this is so important because they need to feel part of this program, so that they can work together. This avoids fragmentation and also will avoid this program being something that is used to supplant or take the place of the regular programs that should address the needs of struggling readers anyway. This should support, not supplant, what is going on on an everyday basis. These kids need extra attention, extra help, additional support.

So, lots of collaboration all along the way, and very specifically with content area teachers and, by the way -- and I think here's where the new Common Core

Standards will really be helpful -- the whole notion that in the regular program, indeed, there should be links with the content areas and the literacy. We have been talking about this for at least 200 years. That's how long I have been around; we've been talking about it.

And yet, it is still not done as much as it should be, but the new Common Core Standards really demand it. So, I am really looking forward to that all along the way.

Support professional development of all involved and building capacity. If we look at it that way, it won't be an add-on; it won't be a tack-on, just something that is there until the grant runs out.

So, it is that synergy that I am talking about, based on principles of developmentally-appropriate practice. People at the early grades talk about this a lot, but, you know, there is adolescent literacy, there is adolescent development. So,

developmentally-appropriate practice is relevant throughout.

It should be engaging. There's no reason why it can't be interesting.

Scaffolded, that is certainly an effort that needs to be focused on in the classroom, teachers who show kids how to do it and what to do, not just tell them.

I have already talked about differentiation. And again, it is how we organize the curriculum as well as what happens in the classroom.

Explicit instruction, yes, but planful, and that is a word that is not in my dictionary on the computer. It always comes up. But I like that word, "planful". That is, there is planned activities for children to do that link to that direct instruction that they can do independently or in small groups.

Formative assessment, I could go on and on and on. A really good plan is going

to have a strong, formative assessment 1 2 component that helps teachers record data. And I'm not just talking about numbers. 3 4 talking about work samples that they have 5 actually reviewed and made decisions about in 6 terms of what a child knows as well as what a 7 child needs, and then made instructional 8 decisions based on it, and, of course, that 9 synergy between knowledge base in terms of 10 content and the English language arts. Just quickly, some cautionary 11

Just quickly, some cautionary notes: very often, these are elements of proposals of this sort. Especially the struggling readers in the past, I know very often extended time was a key element.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

With the proposals, be careful that these are designed well. It is not just tacking on an hour at the end of the day.

More time, if it is not used wisely, is not good investment in the child's time. The child's time is important.

Use of appropriately-difficult

texts, again, if they are still dealing with text they can't read, then they can't learn the strategies for reading from those texts.

So, we need texts that they can handle, so that we can teach the strategies through them.

Expert instruction, just not a nice, warm body in there at the end of the day, really specialized people who know what they are doing in terms of reading. So, I would be curious to see what the staff that is involved, what their background would be.

And this last one looks like, what is she talking about? You know, there are a lot of these programs where the kids don't read and write very much. You know, circling worksheets is not reading and writing.

Specialized staff, some things to consider: appropriate selection, shared understanding of roles, and use of time and effort. Get these people together and let them work together.

Tutoring, a word about that.

Training and supervision, not, again, just finding people who want to help. Consistency of effort, coordination. It is that kind of progress monitoring that can be very informal.

And then, I have already talked about technology and some of the things that we need to consider.

And the heart of it all, professional development.

I have 30 seconds and I am ending on time, thank goodness.

Professional development is
everything, and it really needs to be embedded
into the program. What we learn in
professional development, we do. What we do,
we come back and share and we talk about and
we learn more things, and it is something that
is ongoing. This is the heart and soul, I
think, of really making it an excellent
program.

And I am told to stop, and believe it or not, I'm finished.

1 (Laughter.)

2 Thank you very, very much.

3 (Applause.)

4 DR. MELENDEZ DE SANTA ANA: Thank

you, Professor Strickland. Thank you very

6 much.

7 I would like to ask Professor

8 Kamil, next, please, and I will share his bio.

9 Professor Kamil is a faculty

10 member in the School of Education at Stanford

11 University. He served on the Steering

12 Committee of the United States 2009

13 Administration of PISA.

14 He is a member of the Adolescent

15 Literacy Advisory Board for the Alliance for

16 Excellent Education.

17 Professor Kamil shared on the

18 research panel for the New York State ELA

19 | Standards Revision.

20 He is also an advisor for the

21 Louisiana Department of Education Adolescent

22 Literacy Plan and works in similar capacities

for State Departments of Education in Oregon and in New Jersey.

He was a member of the Feedback

Group and the Writing Team for the Common Core

Standards. He was a member of the National

Reading Panel and was a member of the RAND

Corporation Reading Study Group.

He is a member of the National Literacy Panel, synthesizing reading research on language minority students. He chaired the Planning Committee for the 2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress Reading Framework.

In addition, he is a member of the Carnegie Corporation Advisory Council on Advancing Adolescent Literacy. He is also the Chair of the Reading Advisory Panel for the Pacific Regional Educational Laboratory.

He recently served as the Chair of the Panel that produced "Improving Adolescent Literacy, Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices", a Practice Guide from the

1 Institute of Educational Sciences.

Other publications have included "Handbooks of Reading Research", Volumes 1, 2, 3, and 4. He also co-edited a volume on early childhood professional development for Susan Neuman, "Preparing Teachers for the Early Childhood Classroom", that has just been released.

So, Professor?

DR. KAMIL: Thank you.

I always hate long introductions because it shows that I wasn't smart enough to say no to some things.

(Laughter.)

Let me start. Here are some questions that I wanted to address. I am not going to read the questions to you so much as just let you look at them.

The first thing that needs to be addressed in any proposal about striving readers is instruction. I want to start with the Common Core as a set of targets. It is a

broad umbrella that embraces all four communication skills.

And what I am going to do is give you the sort of philosophical highlights of what we want skilled readers to be able to do. These are characteristics for skilled readers.

And independence is the No. 1
thing here. Coming from the Silicon Valley,
where we do a lot of collaborative efforts,
this is sometimes shortchanged in favor of
collaboration. We need to have both.

Strong content is one of the things that many standards efforts overlook, particularly in literacy and the fact that literacy is key to building strong content knowledge. And in reading and writing, although it is easier to see in writing perhaps than this, that a skilled reader responds to the demands of audience, task, purpose, and discipline.

Common Core is one of the few explicit recognitions that reading is

different across different content areas; writing is different across different content areas, different disciplines.

Comprehend as well as critique is another thing that skilled readers have to do, not only to understand, but be able to be critical and analytic about what it is they have read.

Perhaps the most important one here, this probably should be first, but I am honoring the Common Core list, is valuing evidence. It turns out in the very recent 2009 12th grade NAEP data, what distinguishes advanced readers from everybody else is their ability to understand the text and provide evidence that their understanding is the correct interpretation.

Students need to use technology strategically and capably, and they need to understand other cultures. It's a long list of things, but those are the things that we have got to guarantee that even striving

readers get, and that needs to be at the core of the proposal.

I am just going to show you where these also fit in terms of other policy issues. National Assessment has a new framework at the beginning of last year in which these are the cognitive targets. You can't escape that, even if you do international benchmarking. The PISA framework, which was also new in 2009, has essentially the same cognitive targets. Those are what we have to get students to be able to do, no matter what else we do with them.

Several years ago, two years ago I guess, the Institute for Educational Sciences produced what we call a Practice Guide. There are five recommendations in instruction. I give you these without spending a lot of time elaborating them.

But at least this ought to be the core for striving readers. This was the intent of that document. It is what you do in

practice to follow up on making adolescent literacy better.

It turns out that, for the first two and the last one, the evidence base is extremely strong, and for the middle two, it is moderate. So, these are pretty high recommendations, so a lot of research to back that up.

Let me also say that now we are going to move into sort of a professional development issue, but teachers need to be prepared on that. If you have looked at the Common Core, I like to joke that there are 12 teachers out there who could teach those right now.

We need to spend a lot of time in professional development -- I think you are going to hear that as a general theme -- because we are requiring different things and we are requiring much more sophistication in terms of teaching.

Teaching reading in the

disciplines, in particular, has been neglected over and over again, despite all the rhetoric, over at least 75 years of people claiming that every teacher should teach reading.

The valuing of the evidence is another thing that we don't do a lot of. And again, that's important.

But the other thing is we need to start well before students get to be adolescent. As we back this up to see how we prepare students to do that as adolescents, we have got to worry about the transitions between stages in schools.

So, students moving from home to a pre-K setting, moving from a pre-K setting to a formal kindergarten setting, moving from fourth grade in the elementary format to a very rigid scheduling of middle school, and then on to ninth grade, those transitions are essential to consider in terms of making sure that the alignment is appropriate. And these comprehensive plans that are being developed

by the states need to account for that, and it needs to be reflected in successful proposals.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

One other important thing about instruction is that we need to make sure that we provide appropriate support for instruction for students. In that list of five recommendations, the last one is strategic tutoring. Sometimes that instructional support can't be done in the classroom. successful proposal for striving readers has to account for taking students out of the classroom, so that you don't spend all of the time on a very few students and let the other ones suffer. We need to add additional time. And that's where extended time for literacy for me is easy to work into the schedule for those students who need it.

I don't want to spend a lot of time and ignore writing, which we have recently found some wonderful work by Stephen Graham and his colleagues in a document called "Writing to Read", which shows that writing

actually can improve reading. And we have known that for a long time. Now we have a research base and an analysis to show that.

I'm also going to suggest that we need to think about 21st century skills in a realistic context. If you look at most 21st century skills and you want to be serious about them, they require lots more 19th century skills than they do 21st century skills.

So, the reading part of that becomes even more essential in 21st century skills; writing as well. If you want to take a look at almost any manual that comes with your VCR or DVD player, you know that writing is an important skill that we need to develop.

So, let me turn to professional development and talk a little bit about what makes high-quality professional help. The report of the National Reading Panel, this is a section that got ignored, but reviewed all of the research in professional development

for reading.

For several years after that, a student of mine and I were supported by the Mid-Atlantic Regional Educational Laboratory to continue that review. What we found is there is very little attention to student outcomes, and that was a problem in the research base. But there are three criteria that we have to worry about in professional development that very often don't get attended to.

No. 1, if you do professional development, it means that you need to change teacher knowledge. If you do whatever we call professional development and teachers don't learn something, there is nothing beyond that. They will continue to do what they do.

But they also need to take that knowledge and implement it somehow. And then, we have got to worry about the student outcomes because we could have those first two conditions being met and students not

succeeding. We need to do all three of those, and we need to do that evaluation of professional development as a routine rather than the "Did you like it?" kind of evaluation that we do. "Did you find this useful?" Everybody says yes. Everybody heads for the door at two o'clock, and they don't actually spend the time that they need in learning.

I think that we need to worry about embedded professional development in each of the disciplines, so that we can't have a general discipline-free professional development, except for a few topics. But we really need to focus on getting teachers comfortable with the idea that they can teach kids to read in their content areas. Once they do, their jobs become easier because they don't have to stand in front of the class and read the books to the students, the textbooks.

Here are just some other things.

You have seen some of this. Differentiated

professional development is important. Novice

teachers need a different kind of professional development from experienced teachers. A good proposal ought to cover that kind of condition. Any sort of induction program ought to be different from that provided for experienced teachers.

It ought to be comprehensive. In other words, you ought to have professional development that is both schoolwide, systemwide, districtwide, whatever it is that you have control over, because we need to keep this going. It needs to be continuous as well.

And the most important thing as a researcher, I am going to say, is that it has to be research-based. And very often, we get the personal opinion kind of professional development. "I like this." I have sat in any number of presentations and cringed at the suggestions which go counter to the research base that we have.

Let me turn a little bit, I would

love to spend the rest of the time talking about instruction in professional development, but, then, let me talk about a couple of other issues that are equally important.

And so, here's this question about universal design and, then, another one about using technology with limited-English-proficient children and youth, and children and youth with disabilities.

I want to make sure that everybody understands we aren't putting second language learners and disabilities together as populations. They are just two separate populations.

But, in fact, the principles of universal design are a set of concepts, ideas, programming techniques, and computer-assisted text displays that give access to the text for students who can't access traditional print.

So, for example, you might have the text being read to you with a screen reader. You might have definitions being

provided, if you needed it. You might have translations being provided, if you needed those.

So, this is really an important issue in terms of making text accessible to all students in an ideal way. But I want to go beyond that for technology.

There are some uses of technology that we can't avoid; they need to be included in specific instructional modules in all programs up and down the line. Many of the new standards do that. I suspect that the Common Core has less of that technology emphasis for my taste, but, then, that's my specialty. So, I always like to see more.

But we have to do that. We can't ignore teaching students how to read critically on the internet, how to do searches on the internet, how to use those resources online in principled ways.

The number of times students get caught cheating -- I don't know if you have

seen these latest statistics -- cutting and pasting things from the internet or from Wikipedia, or whatever, just simply putting that as their own work. We need to make sure that we actually do those kinds of things.

I can't imagine teaching writing without using word processing these days. It is just, if I said that 10 years ago, people would have kind of guffawed. I can't even imagine that that would be successful. And it's one of the few tools that matches the theoretical part of process writing almost piece for piece. So, I think we need to deal with that as well.

Again, let me repeat what I started this with is that, for 21st century skills, we really need more 19th and 20th century skills than we ever thought possible. We can't shortchange traditional reading and writing.

So, here is a summary of all of that. I want to add one more piece to this.

1 These are really important kinds of things.

But it turns out that we have had very little

success in using computers to teach reading,

and it is an entire agent. So, these global

programs just to teach reading have not been

very successful. There are several large
scale studies that show that, and repeatedly

the evidence is very slim.

But where computers are useful in instruction is as supplemental kinds of things. It is one more way to leverage instructional time.

Okay. So, what kind of evidence do we need to have? One of the things, I have reviewed proposals from states for all sorts of things before, from state departments of education and the like. And one of the things that is almost always missing is the evidence that you have the capacity or will develop the capacity to implement and conduct the program the way it has been proposed.

Because of that, I think that is

the first kind of evidence, that there needs to be some infrastructure. There needs to be a plan for completing and to show that they can actually be implemented.

The major place that I would look for that is that there's a large body of work on reading. And, in particular, IES has been just relentless in putting together large-scale studies of programs. We have some that actually show negative effect sizes, and yet I run into schools that are adopting them brand-new. Now that means that, if we left those kids alone, they would be better off than if we gave them the program.

Without making major

modifications, programs that don't work should

not be adopted. And the plan for making those

modifications, if you want to adopt something,

needs to be included in proposals.

So, No. 1 is a review of that kind of research that we know is out there and that tells us about the effectiveness of particular

interventions, particularly at the adolescent level, but all the way down through elementary. We need to have and we need to have evidence that there's some modification if you want to pursue that program.

Now one of the things that happens is everybody out there in the world says, no, that study didn't match my population. Well, let's see exactly what that means and what your plans are for modifying it to make it match your population. So, I think that is an important piece.

There we go. Okay. And then, what strategies to evaluate and monitor the job.

I gave you the three criteria for professional development before. I don't know that I need to do that.

But one important thing here is,
when I am asked to do professional development
work, I really insist that administrators
participate as well. I just don't want to

waste the time in dealing only with the teaching staff and then not having a supportive administrative or an institutional memory when the principal leaves and a new principal comes that just throws out everything that we have done. So, the easy way to address that, not easy but at least a convenient way to address that, is simply to go through and say, okay, everybody participates.

It has got to be evaluated. I already said that. It has got to be aligned with the curriculum and the needs of the teachers. In much the way that I talked about earlier, it has got to be differentiated. And it has got to be schoolwide. You can't have a few people wanting to have one kind of professional development and then another one, unless their needs are specifically addressed by those different professional development opportunities.

And now here's the tough one:

evaluation has always been the stepchild of educational implementation. And I don't think that is going to change much here. So, what should you require? Well, for my money, that is the only way that you are going to get success.

And I would point to at least one of my favorite programs, because I have worked with it so long, is the Early Childhood

Educator Professional Development Program from the Department, which actually mandated that we do experimental or quasi-experimental evaluations.

So, my suggestion is that we not do blanket adoptions or blanket implementations, but we do this as staggered implementations, accompanied by appropriate sorts of evaluations that allow us to make the conclusions about whether or not those programs are working, coupled with forming the evaluation to change those programs in ways that will make them better and improve them

1 over the course of time.

kinds of things.

Given the funding issue, you know,
there's just some real tough choices here.

But there is a network of the Regional

Educational Laboratories and the Comprehensive
Centers that are tasked with cooperating with
states to do just these kinds of evaluations.

And the proposals ought to make use of those

And I would suggest that, in addition, there are lots of eager professors at universities who would love to have sites to do research that they are interested in. That is another kind of cooperative effort.

So, here are the major themes, as I said:

We need to have research-based programs. We need to pay strict attention to that research. And if there's anything, that is the No. 1 issue.

We need to have an alignment of interventions, so that we don't adopt a lot of

- 1 programs that actually fight with each other.
- 2 Some of them actually try to do different
- 3 things in the opposite.
- 4 We need high-quality professional
- 5 development. We need rigorous evaluation, and
- 6 we need to incorporate technology as
- 7 appropriate.
- 8 Thank you.
- 9 (Applause.)
- DR. STRICKLAND: Thank you,
- 11 Professor.
- 12 I would like to now introduce
- 13 Professor Nonie Lesaux, who is a Marie and Max
- 14 Kargman Associate Professor in Human
- 15 Development and Urban Education Advancement at
- 16 Harvard Graduate School of Education.
- 17 She leads a research program that
- 18 focuses on increasing opportunities to learn
- 19 for students from diverse linguistic,
- 20 cultural, and economic backgrounds, a growing
- 21 population in today's classrooms.
- 22 | From 2002 to 2006, Lesaux was the

Senior Research Associate at the National
Literacy Panel on Language, Minority Children

3 and Youth.

In 2007, Lesaux was named one of the five WT Grant Scholars, earning a \$350,000, five-year award from the WT Grant Foundation in support of her research on English language learners in urban public schools.

In 2009, she was recipient of the Presidential Early Career Award for Scientists and Engineers, the highest honor given by the United States Government to young professionals beginning their independent research careers.

Her studies in reading and vocabulary development, as well as instructional strategies to prevent reading difficulties, have implications for practitioners, researchers, and policymakers. This research is supported by grants from several organizations, including the Institute

of Education Services, the Eunice Kennedy
Shriver National Institute of Child Health and
Human Development, the William and Flora
Hewlett Foundation, and the Council of the
Great City Schools.

A native of Canada, Lesaux earned her doctorate in educational psychology and special education from the University of British Columbia.

Thank you.

DR. LESAUX: Thank you. Good morning, and thank you for the invitation.

I am going to spend a little time kind of shifting gears towards thinking about a particular population of learners that we might really be attending to as we think through this Striving Readers Program. So, I am going to talk a little about this notion of the 21st century America, just who the children in our communities and schools are today, what we know about their reading development, and what that means as far as

pressing issues that we need to address via such programs and policies, and can we link what it is we know to what it is we do.

So, I am going to start just by ensuring that we are all on the same page, that really linguistic and cultural diversity is inherent in our children today. We have over 400 languages in the U.S. By 2050, it is projected we will be looking at about 35 percent of the population in the country from immigrant families. And that is a large and fast-growing group.

What I want to be very clear about in terms of this Striving Readers Program from birth to 12th grade is that our largest and fastest-growing group of children from immigrant families are actually U.S.-born.

They are born here. They are being served in our communities through our health and human services and our education systems.

So, we think a little less about these particular groups of, say, the small

groups of newcomers. We think about them certainly in the design of effective policies and practices, but we think a lot about the students, the children who are enrolling in our preschools, who are into kindergarten who are reclassified as fully English-proficient by first and second grade and going up through the ranks. That is our largest and fastest-growing group, which has real policy implications.

So, we think a lot about cultural, linguistic, and economic diversity as a reality, that in these applications we ought not to see a section on how we are going to deal with our linguistic diversity, but, rather, we see linguistic and cultural diversity, economic diversity as really a trail and a thread running right through the application.

I will note that this year, in fact, sadly, we have our highest rate of child poverty that we have had in 20 years currently

in 2010. So, we are thinking a lot about all settings and all programs rather than certain subpopulations.

And what is that we are learning from recent research on this group of children from economic- and linguistically-diverse backgrounds? Let me run you through very quickly three studies that I think really represent trends that are out there across the country and that ought to be acknowledged and embedded in these proposals.

So, the first is one study where we have followed a group of U.S.-born children of Latino immigrants who we recruited from Head Start programs in 2001. They are currently in the eighth grade. We have been following them since they were age 4. Let me show you their trend very quickly, for those of you who think a lot about reading.

The black line is the national norm for letter/word identification, which is their ability to crack the code and read

words. And you can see that their skills in the blue line map directly onto national modeling norms. But, actually, they started out below where we would place a native English speaker, which makes very good sense because, of course, these are second language learners. We are not going to hold them to anything early on.

In fact, their rates of growth well surpassed the national norm. So, these are children who are really benefitting from the curriculum and, in fact, growing at really fast rates. So, their ability to read the words is totally typical.

Where we get the real gap is, of course, is the word knowledge. So, you will see here we start out with this gap in English vocabulary, which obviously makes sense. At age 4, they are going to have fewer English words than their native English-speaking counterparts. But you will see that the gap persists all the way through, in this case

this is fifth grade. These data are in press. We could show you these data right up through the end of seventh grade.

What's disconcerting to me when I look at this trend is that, in fact, here again, their rates of growth surpass the national norm. They are growing at a faster rate in their language skills than their native English-speaking peers.

The problem is it would need to be even faster to close those gaps. But it also suggests that we ought to design the environment a little differently to capitalize on this learning ability, that what we have here is no problem at all with the ability to learn those words, but now we have got to do something so that we are not creating this mismatch.

And so, what we get with this sample, for example, is that by the end of fifth grade they have vocabulary and comprehension scores in around the 17th

percentile. Okay? End of middle school, 17
percentile in reading comprehensive and
English vocabulary places at exceptional risk
to not be able to complete high school.

Yet, these are, again, recruited from Head Start's 2001, U.S.-born population, come up through the system. Attendance looks pretty good. We have looked at all kinds of other variables. Ultimately, what we need to think through is the design of that learning environment for these students.

These students are also in settings that are predominantly serving children like them. So, we ought to think more universally about that.

If we take it to a different study and we look at a sample we followed similarly from fourth through eighth grade, U.S.-born and educated in this case on the West Coast -- the last study was here on the East Coast -- we find the very same pattern. By the end of eighth grade, we get this tremendous gap

between the ability to read the words accurately and efficiently and having the word knowledge to support comprehension.

So, here's a sample that is leaving eighth grade with reading comprehension scores in around the 25th percentile, U.S.-born, U.S.-educated, leaving middle school around the 25th percentile in comprehension. And the game is only going to get more difficult at the level of language of text.

When we did this work, the last data I want to show you is actually that, when we do this work and compare their profiles, the language minority learners' profiles to those of their native English speakers in the very same classrooms who are similarly struggling, we actually get the very same profile, right? So, there's a point at which, by the middle and high school, what we are really talking about is the academic language, the register, the language of text. These are

all students with excellent conversational and basic communication skills; no question.

And just to push on that a little bit more, we just recently conducted a study with a subsample from the longitudinal study I showed you first. And here is the further dilemma: when they talk to us about their reading strategies after we administer a passage and some questions, they are certainly active comprehenders in a sense. They are talking about their strategies. They have clearly reasoned processes for finding information.

The problem is, if you don't bring enough background knowledge to that passage to begin with, if you don't have a good sense of the rainforest, then your strategies that you are applying are not so helpful because you are looking without enough of a mental model of that text.

So, we think about strategies as a great mechanism for leveraging background

knowledge, but without the background knowledge, we find that, of course, the strategies are applied and used in ways that are not particularly helpful.

The other thing that we have been thinking a lot about in terms of these environments is actually the quality of the language that is used in the settings. So, one of the things we are finding -- this is from research, an IES-funded study, thousands of hours of videotape.

What we have been doing is coding, actually, for the quality of the language in their classrooms. So, we think a lot about not just children's profiles, but in this case we coded quality of teachers' input.

And of course, what we are finding is real significant variation in the sophisticated language use that is out there. So that, in the absence of even any intervention or special program, we have kids, for example, in this study who are exposed to

50 percent less of sophisticated language than a student who might be in a classroom next door. And, lo and behold, of course, when we model the impact of just the kinds of inputs that these children are receiving, we find it has tremendous impact on their end-of-year reading comprehension and vocabulary scores.

So, even in a middle school setting where they may have that teacher just 90 minutes a day, in fact, the magnitude, the effects are actually the same and/or larger than some of the effects that researchers get in trying to intervene. So, we sort of see, we are thinking a lot about elevating the bar, the oral language bar, for both students and the adults in the buildings because there is a lot of incidental learning that goes on just by being immersed in a high-quality language environment.

So, what does all this mean for how we might think, then, about striving readers with the linguistically-, culturally-,

economically-diverse populations who are out there? How we link what it is we know to what it is we do?

Well, I am going to take a minute and talk sort of about four areas that I think are particularly important with this population in the mind.

The first is that the programs themselves and the supports that are designed have sufficient intensity to meet readers' needs. And by that, I mean particularly in the birth to 5 and in the community literacy world, we have a lot of excellent models as far as their design.

But in their implementation, it is too light a touch. There are light-touch models. We have great examples of mothers being sent home with good information from the hospital about talking to their baby and young child, but that is the end of that service.

We have great examples of community literacy programs that may only run

once a month. We have all kinds of examples where, in fact, the design is there, but the duration and the intensity lacks to really gain enough traction to change behaviors around literacy and to elevate the quality of language environments.

So, we think a lot about, also, that in many cases the funding mechanism is for reach. How many families can we hit or touch? And in fact, what we want to do is slow down and make sure that we are actually having an impact, reallocate for depth, and then take it to scale.

Because the danger is that families like it, children like it, but in the end is it adding up to change language and literacy outcomes? So, we think a lot about intensity, duration, and scope.

Similarly, we hear a lot about supplemental supports that are short-term that may not be very closely matched to deal with the instructional content. So, for those of

you who have worked with the struggling readers out there, you know that different adults are selecting different plans, and different domains are focused on throughout the day. In fact, some of our striving readers have the most chaotic instructional experience. So, we need to think through, how do we get a closer match between our supplemental supports and daily instruction and intervention?

We have heard about this already this morning, but we have a tendency to say here are the kids who are struggling on the State Standards Test, and here's what they're all going to get. And frankly, you know, I don't need to say much more after Michael Kamil's presentation, but an adolescent reader may be struggling with comprehension for very different reasons than their peer. And so, we need to think carefully about that match as well.

Increasing opportunities to learn

also means we need to think about summer. So, we would like to see some of these plans talk about ways in which they may increase opportunities to learn throughout the summer, buffering that summer learning loss, and generating closer connections to after-school programs. Many of these students do attend after-school programs. In many cases, status quo would say that it is a lost opportunity to keep building on knowledge and skills.

Second is this notion of knowledge-based literacy instruction. So, if we go back to the profiles of our readers whose rates of growth are very good, who are reading the words on the page, who have some sense of how they are going to go through and find information and text, and who can talk about their strategies, what we are really talking about to address their needs is to focus more on their knowledge and to think about knowledge-based literacy instruction.

So, as we think about these

smaller problem spaces and these larger ones, what we are really talking about with the larger problem space is this building up background knowledge.

So, rather than necessarily -- you know, we have this sense that we want to talk about the pendulum or the way that we are thinking about the design of assessment and services, and we tend to want to think about the code and the early skills. We know that what they are struggling with later is more in the critical thinking, academic vocabulary, conceptual knowledge world.

And rather than sort of talk about this balanced instruction and try to find a balanced model, what we are really talking is anchoring all of that instruction in big ideas, in abstract concepts, in academic language. So that we are not looking for plans that suggest "And here will be our time for word reading, and here will be our time for comprehension, and here will be our time

for vocabulary."

What we are really looking for is here are the big ideas and the units and the concepts that are going to guide our study.

So, we are going to think about reading instruction as studying concepts, and within that, we are going to do some really good phonics work and some really good comprehension work.

So, what we end up with is reading instruction in the service of content learning rather than in the service of reading skills.

And what we often see in proposals for struggling readers is a real skills-based kind of approach.

And what we want to do is move much more, and this is certainly in line with the Common Core Standards, what we really want to do is really push on content, and that our vocabulary work is just tied to the big idea and the concept under study, as is our phonics work, as is our high school work on the

listening and speaking standards, where we're going to do some dialog and debate and discourse.

So, we are trying to move away from these pieces of literacy instruction to a much more content-driven approach in which you then gain language and literacy skills.

So, it means, also, that we are going to have to have an increase in opportunities for academic and productive talk beyond providing responses. To change those trajectories that I started with, kids are absolutely going to have to talk a lot more than they do. It is going to have to be much more planned. It is going to have to be extended in nature. They are going to have to have dialog and discourse. One cannot reason through big ideas and build their language skills without the opportunity to do just that.

And in fact, just back to what makes good writing, some of what makes good

writing is good opportunities to discuss and plan. We are going to have to move more quickly from conversational supports to academic language supports. They are going to get those basic communication skills incidentally. They are going to pick those up over time. They are U.S.-born; they are here. The day-to-day conversation comes.

What they are not getting is the academic language. That requires significant instruction. Even for our newcomer ELLs, we are going to have to move quickly from basic and survival English to academic language.

But it means that educators and children need the big ideas to talk about. It needs to be anchored in text. It needs to be anchored in some abstract concepts.

So, for example, here we might think about this approach as one starts with a big idea or question, and all of the kinds of literacy sorts of work, whether it is for young children or older children, falls in and

around that. So, it is thematic and it is content-based.

It certainly aligns very much with the Common Core Standards, where we are pushing on both the reading blocks and our English language arts classrooms to be much more driven by content.

Let me say two other things. The adults roles in capacity-building, we have heard a lot about already this morning. So, I am not going to say too much.

But, of course, with this

population in mind, it is no longer feasible

to rely on a specialist or specialization

model. So, in those plans, we ought to see

lots of discussion about building capacity

across the system rather than specialized

roles for people to serve our English language

learners.

Incidentally, that model has been historically fairly inefficient and ineffective. It is an expensive route, even

in the special education world. It has been a very expensive route with not a lot of return.

It means we are going to have to expand professional education. We have heard more about that. But even in our after-school and family literacy programs, we are going to want to push on these ideas around oral language and complex concepts and elevating the bar.

And finally, Michael already
mentioned it, but we are going to have to
foster the site-level instructional
leadership, clear roles for administrators in
managing diversity and elevating the bar
around literacy and language.

And finally, I want to just say a few things about assessment. So, first is in many cases, of course, we all know that the first statewide indicator of reading comprehension levels is often at the third grade, which is exceptionally late to find out

there are these strugglers who need it.

Our early literacy assessments
that are implemented out there are mostly
code-based. So, we also have, again, those
students in all of those students would have
looked very good on the average early literacy
assessment. They would have their letters.
They have their sounds, et cetera.

So, even starting assessments at pre-K, however, is late. So, we are thinking a lot in some of the State work I am doing with Massachusetts, we are thinking a lot about partnerships with community and medical providers, health and human services. There are a lot of touchpoints, especially with immigrant families, long before children get to school, opportunities to have more conversation and gain more information about language development and milestones.

Finally, I just want to talk a little about the importance of assessing not just children, but the quality of the settings

that they are in. The only way that we are going to shift practices and shift professional development and emphasis on what it is we are providing to kids is if we start measuring setting-level issues. And certainly, with these learners in mind, we absolutely need to do that.

And ideally, the state would put forth some sort of sense that there is going to be a statewide database where we can actually track kids over time, and several states have done this recently.

So, ultimately, increased intensity, this knowledge-based literacy instruction, assessments before school begins, and assessment systems that have a real focus on oral language. For our ELLs, we are really talking about opportunities to build oral language skills in many more ways than the basic language and a formal plan, even for continued support for those who are reclassified.

It is very clear that 1 2 classification at the primary grade is not a 3 very good predictor of academic success later. 4 So, we are really back to that universal 5 design for learning. 6 Thank you very much. 7 (Applause.) 8 DR. MELENDEZ DE SANTA ANA: 9 you very much. Thank you, panelists. Thank you 10 for the information. We really appreciate it. 11 12 I think it is time, we are running 13 a little late, so we might just have time for 14 a couple of questions at this point. 15 You know, something that is part 16 of our theory of actions is looking at the 17 role that data plays in, one, tracking how 18 students are doing. And we talked a little 19 bit about that. Also, how it informs 20 instruction, more importantly. 21 When we look at data, whether it 22 is formal or informal assessments, what role

do you see? We talked a little bit about it as well in informing professional development and also keeping sort of a level of accountability.

What role do you see the states in developing that sort of system? And what role do you see LEAs in developing that system?

And that's open.

DR. STRICKLAND: I think that the state needs to be sure that whatever the subgrantees, the LEAs, include in their proposal really has both. What I would like to see is formative assessment linked to some of it.

And just a minute of background:

I am very upset about the amount of testtaking, mindless test-taking practice that I
see going on, especially with kids who are
considered striving readers and writers, in
poor communities, minority communities. It is
just a total waste of time and there's no
teaching going on. The kids do page 15 and

16. They do terribly on it, and the teacher says, "Pay attention. Try harder." So, they do 19 and 20, and what they are learning is "I can't do this, and I couldn't do it yesterday and I probably won't be able to do it tomorrow."

I would like to have a big bonfire. Any publishers in the room here?

I'm probably in big trouble.

But there are ways to have formative assessments linked to standards where children are involved in doing the kinds of things that are on the summative, and I am thinking mainly of constructive response, for example, and writing on demand, but constructive response and writing on demand that relates to the content under study, the inquiry kinds of projects, and so on, that they are working on, whether they are doing it through technology or whether they are just doing it with a yellow pad, but they have to think in the ways that the Common Core

Standards requires them to do.

This way, they are practicing the format of the summative, but they are dealing with the content and the standards that are in play right at the time when they are needed.

I really would love to see that in somebody's plan. This is a serious problem.

DR. KAMIL: This has to be at the state level, and it probably even needs to go beyond the state border.

The one thing about striving readers is that they are a highly-mobile population. They move around a lot. We need to keep track of where they are when they move from school to school. I could bore you with a lot of research horror stories where we have tried to keep track of kids moving across districts and schools.

That needs to be done, and you need to have a very sophisticated system. But you also need to have the right assessments for the adolescent literacy focus. We just

don't have a lot of great assessments that do 1 2 anything except the word-level kinds of things 3 that you were talking about. And it only 4 helps about 20 percent of the struggling 5 readers, which, in turn, is about 20 percent. 6 So, it is a very small return, and yet we 7 continue to do that. 8 So, we need to begin to track 9 other things. And I like your list of what we should track. But we need to develop those 10 11 assessments, and that needs to be done at the 12 state level, at the very least.

DR. MELENDEZ DE SANTA ANA: Okay.

Do you have anything to add? Okay.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. YUDIN: Yes, I want to thank you all. This was an incredibly useful and productive hour or so. And I have 100 questions, but I probably have time for one.

(Laughter.)

Professors Strickland and Kamil, you talked a lot about technology and using technology in purposeful and strategic ways,

1 implying that it is really imperative that we

2 use it, but it has got to be carefully done.

I was wondering if you could kind of elaborate on that.

5 DR. STRICKLAND: Okay. You fed 6 right into another concern that I have.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The consortia that are developing the technology-based assessments for the Common Core Standards are planning -- and I have only read a little bit of the plan -- but they are planning what they call adaptive technologies in terms of the assessment. I haven't seen them. They haven't been developed yet.

But in keeping, again, with what Michael is saying, I like to see adaptive tests that are not just linear. Do you know what I mean? So, the kid scores 25. It doesn't mean you just move them down a notch or move them, if they score high, you know, move them up a notch.

Nonie talked about being more

targeted. I talked in more global ways. She was more specific.

It is not just the score. But if you are going to be adaptive, then you have to develop technologies that really look and see what it is this learner needs. We could get the same score and have very different needs.

So, I would like to press for these brilliant people who are working in these consortia to think about. Everything that I have read so far means that the adaptations are going to be in some linear way.

DR. KAMIL: No.

DR. STRICKLAND: They aren't?

Okay, Michael, if you would speak to that?

DR. KAMIL: That really was once upon a time the way you did it. But now there are all kinds of algorithms that you can use to look at what pattern of errors students

make and adapt that way.

I don't want to prejudge that.

Those folks are just getting started. We could do a lot of speculation.

But I want to go back to what I said and reiterate. We can't ignore technology. There are still some classrooms that do.

We need to make sure -- and you said it; I really like the way you said it -- we need to make sure that, whatever the assessment is, it provides double-duty. So that it is instructive as well as informative in terms of having students do the kinds of things that we want them to do in the real world.

We could develop those assessments, and I hope that those consortia will do that. As I said, I don't want to prejudge what they are doing or even predict what their outcome is going to be.

But we need to begin to think about this assessment, that we don't have enough instructional techniques to match to

the fine distinctions that we can make in many assessments. And so, we are developing very sharp-edged assessments when sort of a butter knife would do. And we only have a few instructional techniques, and that is what we have to think about. What different instructional patterns could you fit on a group of students based on the assessment? And it is a lot smaller than the distinctions we make.

DR. LESAUX: I was just going to say the other way to think about technology is, as we aim to sort of bring the world a little bit more deliberately and planfully to these learners, there is a lot of room to use technology. So, if the challenge in the science class is building up background because it is hard to explain a glacier and the way in which its thickness matters for the speed at which it moves, then the videoclips that are out there, whether it's National Geographic or something else posted, those

1 kinds of things.

In our own intervention work, we have students generating podcasts to talk about a particular issue, to disseminate knowledge. So, there's ways in which we can be really planful and careful in our use of technology.

The other thing is, as we aim to build up background, there are ways in which taking print out of the equation can be really helpful to striving readers, of course. So, in that sense, it is also very good.

DR. STRICKLAND: Can I make one other point? I think that the stakes are very high. They're very high.

These are the kids that can make or break a teacher, a district, a school with all that is riding on test scores these days. So, that is what frightens me about the potential for people to take the shortcut and say, "We'll use this program to get test scores." Yes, I'm for getting better test

scores, but can we do it in ways that truly do build lifelong learners and readers?

I think we can do this, but we have to be careful because folks out there are worried about their jobs. This is tied to teacher effectiveness, educator effectiveness. I'm steeped into that literature right now.

So, if your job is on the line, sometimes the thing that you think about doing is let's get right to the test.

DR. MELENDEZ DE SANTA ANA: Great.

Deborah, do you have a question?

MS. SPITZ: We talk a lot, with this program being first to grade 12 and the challenges that that brings, we talk a lot about the importance of alignment.

Could you just sort of kind of sum up, like what are the key elements of when we talk about an aligned system? What are we really talking about alignment?

DR. KAMIL: For me, the real key in alignment is to figure out what goes on in

these bands that we have established. And you could divide them up in slightly different ways from the way they are divided up here, but whatever they are, what has to happen, the major piece of alignment is that the output of one band has to be the input for the next band.

So, somebody has got to think about what teachers are producing at, say, birth to 5 or birth to 3, and then 3 to K, however you want to divide that up. But those transitions really are what cause this trouble.

So, we have a fourth grade slump that really in many people's opinions does affect the kind of text and the format for teaching in text. And we don't consider that. So, we don't change our reading instruction to account for that transition. The same is true for ninth grade as well, that it becomes a more decontexturalized kind of learning.

So, I think that is where I would

- go and focus that effort right on those transition points.
- DR. MELENDEZ DE SANTA ANA: Okay.

  Well, thank you very much. Thank you so much

  for your presentations and your thoughts and

  your insights. We really appreciate it very
- So, what we are going to do next

  is take a five-minute break, a quick five
  minute break.

11 (Laughter.)

7

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

much.

And then, we will line up for the public, for those that are preregistered. If you don't know what number you are, please check at the table outside.

So, we will be back in five minutes.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 10:43 a.m. and went back on the record at 10:53 a.m.)

MS. NEWSOME-JOHNSON: Okay. Why

don't we go ahead and get started?

Again, if you would like to submit 1 2 a document to us, please feel free to do that. And we will start off with our 3 4 first speaker during our public meeting. 5 MR. GREENBERG: Hi. My name is 6 Stuart Greenberg. I'm with the Florida 7 Department of Education. We have combined the 8 Office of Early Learning and Just Read, 9 Florida!, which is our reading language/arts literacy department. 10 I want to say, first, thank you 11 12 for the opportunity to come and speak and to come and learn and listen. 13 14 As we think about the application, 15 there are a few things that we are doing in 16 one of our districts that is here today in conjunction with districts. 17 I think 18 everything needs to flow from the state to the 19 district in concert, and possibly in feeder 20 patterns. 21 When we hear about sustainability 22 and we think about mobility, we know that

students generally move but within the same zip code often. So, if the application could perhaps provide additional points for thought into and articulation of feeder patterns in large urban areas, and succinct birth to 12 grade in smaller areas.

And the second thing that we would like the applications to focus on is a strong focus on what should instruction look like, very detailed by birth to 3, what does language look like, and moving into pre-K all the way up through high school, at the elementary level in the classrooms. What does instruction look like, not just in reading, but in science and in social studies and in math? And then, how does writing support those skills?

Middle and high school content area instruction is as important as intensive intervention. Once students learn to read and have those skills uplifted, how can we use professional development with content area

classrooms, also in special area classrooms with career ed technical teachers, so that reading becomes purposeful and generalized across the curriculum?

When we turn to professional development, we think that is the key, and we would look for professional development that provides models and demonstration. So, professional development should use technology, but the technology should be involved in the demonstration of lessons. We would look for some kind of points for all professional development being modeled and demonstrated either in teachers' classrooms or it must be with teachers' materials.

As we look to follow up on what teachers do, we would like to see -- and we are providing in our application, and we hope that you would look at it very rigorously -- how teachers can self-evaluate: did they use the practice that they were taught with kids? And when administrators, who are part of staff

development, come back to look to look at that, administrators can then use the same type of evaluation instrument or feedback instrument to teachers: what did you say you used? What did I see you use?

And then, in Florida, we are exploding with something called "Lesson Study", where teachers design research lessons and they come in and watch each other teach. They look at student work. Lesson Study becomes a perfect vehicle to look at what teachers say they are doing, how they differentiate it, what administrators see, and as Dorothy mentioned, looking at student work. That is the best evidence in how writing can support that.

So, we look at this initiative as something brand-new. I mean it is a tremendous opportunity to go from birth to 12, but the applications should focus on, we believe: what does instruction look like?

What does professional development look like?

How do teachers provide their own feedback for what they do? How do administrators at the state level, at the local level, provide feedback on going and looking at student work to find the match between performance of strategies and then the outcome?

Because we could see strategies
being used and students growing, but, then, we
can also determine how can we use other
classrooms to build background knowledge, to
build content area instruction, so that at the
end the gap isn't there, which provides a
strong, effective reliance on teaching and
using research-based, informed practices, both
through the findings of IES and professional
development.

But, again, we think that all this should be wrapped into, the focus should be, what does instruction look like and what should the students be able to do, instructing, reading across text, using writing, and then having teachers evaluate

their practice, along with the outcome assessment, but along the way we also know that this needs to be timed for teachers.

When we ask teachers to differentiate, they have to do that in all content areas across all students. So, looking at this across multiple years in a feeder pattern rather than we must do all of this work all at once, a sustained environment for both the development of this initiative and the use of the initiative, especially looking at data from the state level.

So, again, I want to say thank you for a wonderful opportunity, a brand-new initiative focused on teaching and learning, using what we know from science to bring classrooms alive.

Thank you.

MS. WEBER: Good morning.

My name is Jennifer Weber, and I'm with Nemours. We are a private foundation that also operates a premiere children's

1 health system.

Because many of you might not be familiar with it, I will just tell you a little bit about it.

Our goal at Nemours is to help children grow healthy. And that commitment extends beyond work in the healthcare sector. We have invested in early literacy in order to help children become successful readers.

Nemours' BrightStart! was
established in 2005 in Florida to address
dyslexia at a very early age, and it is
targeted to pre-kindergartners and
kindergartners.

So, my comments today will focus on that age group as well as the topics this morning. We will submit written comments.

So, first, on the area of professional development, we couldn't agree more that professional development is critical and have a couple of recommendations that we want to put forward.

First, we really want to see joint trainings for early childhood and early elementary educators that gets at that transition phase, too, but that subgrantees should demonstrate a commitment and plan for bringing together early childhood and early elementary educators.

This training needs to develop a mutual understanding of critical instructional priorities and challenges at each age and grade, and this broader sense of a shared responsibility and accountability for longterm childhood literacy outcomes.

Second, professional development explicitly targeting critical literacy skills and best instructional practices, so that subgrantees demonstrate capacity to provide high-quality professional development that encompasses what to teach and how to teach.

Third, use of universal design for learning and technology in professional development. You know, educators are diverse

learners, too. And the use of high-quality
UDL will ensure that instructional techniques
are engaging and effective, and online
training options make training readily
available and cost-effective.

Fourth, appropriate assessment system. Assessment should be tied closely to critical early literacy skills. That research has shown to be highly predictive of future literacy success.

Ideally, classroom teachers should be able to administer the assessment to reinforce the skills of interest and to administer -- excuse me -- administer it, reinforce the skills of interest, and connect the assessment to instruction, and be able to do it multiple times throughout the year.

And then, fifth, timely access to individual child and classroom-level results.

This is so important to help inform instruction and help teachers be accountable.

On transition alignment, inclusion

of strategies targeted to pre-kindergarten and kindergarten children at state and local levels is critical to reading success. So, it probably goes without saying we are concerned about this 15 percent cap that has been built into the program and encourage some creative thinking about how to address that and not instill additional silos into the reading program.

We really encourage focusing on age-appropriate strategies. You know, it is estimated that up to 40 percent of children enter kindergarten one or more years behind their peers in critical language and reading readiness. You know, it is too late if we wait until third grade to see that they are behind. We really need to invest early.

We also encourage this to look at multi-sector public/private partnerships. We are committed to this program, I know to early literacy and investing in that, and I know others are, too. And we really encourage

subgrantees to pursue partnerships throughout the community.

Among one of the most important lessons we have learned through our work with Nemours' BrightStart! is the need to develop strong, multi-sector public/private partnerships. So that the interventions of programs are pervasive in communities, they tap community assets, and reach children and families where they live, learn, play.

And identifying and funding and sustaining these partnerships are critical to achieving true innovation that leads to lasting changes and sustainability.

And then just one comment on evidence and evaluation. We really believe states should require subgrantees to provide evidence of their capacity to implement innovative literacy programs that are tailored to meet the assets and needs of their community.

So, in closing, Nemours thanks the

U.S. Department of Education for the 1 2 opportunity to provide input on this program. We believe that early identification for 3 individuals at risk of reading failure and 4 5 targeted, intensive intervention are of great 6 public interest, and that this grant program 7 has important potential for improving literacy 8 rates in these children. 9 Thank you. 10 MS. GILLIS: Good morning. I'm Margie Gillis, Research 11 Affiliate from Haskins Laboratories in New 12 Haven, Connecticut, and President of Literacy 13 14 How. 15 I'm here today to speak to the 16 public question entitled "professional development, instruction, and assessment", and 17 18 specifically speak about the essential 19 elements and components of high-quality 20 literacy-related professional development. 21 Since 2000, I have been integrally 22 involved with professional development efforts

in literacy instruction in Connecticut, first, as a research fellow and literacy specialist at Haskins Laboratories and, subsequently, as the Director of the PD initiatives.

Our first project was a research practice feasibility study with funding from the U.S. Department of Ed. Researchers and reading specialists with classroom experience applied reading research in grade K-2 classrooms and trained over 30 mentors, developing training models and tools for teacher training, and establishing three Connecticut model schools to serve as demonstration sites.

As a followup to this study, we formalized our training modules during a four-year teacher quality grant funded by IES.

Acknowledging the fact that first grade teachers' primary responsibility is to teach children to read, this study, conducted in 120 classrooms in 37 schools, focused on first grade reading instruction, studying the

relationship among what teachers know about reading, how it's taught, and how students perform.

When teachers were tested before the professional development began, they knew roughly 50 percent of the items that we tested them on. Our findings were consistent with other studies conducted across the U.S.

Teachers don't know what they don't know.

However, when taught essential concepts with follow-up support and coaching in the classroom, teachers transferred their knowledge to the classroom, and students' literacy skills improved.

Since that study was completed, we have expanded our PD efforts to include pre-K teachers to focus on prevention and early intervention and on the other end of this spectrum, with middle and high school teachers, because many of those teachers' classrooms are filled with students who are reading and writing below grade level.

Reading First Management Team for six years.

All teachers, especially those who work with at-risk readers, must understand the reading research well. They must know how to assess, including word recognition, as well as language comprehension, particularly to Dr. Lesaux's point this morning, and how to select appropriate interventions.

This body of knowledge is
extensive and complex, and our schools and
systems are not designed to provide teachers
with the kind of professional development that
will ensure mastery of this knowledge along
with skilled execution of research-grounded
strategies.

In 11 years, we have mentored more than 600 teachers in over 100 Connecticut schools. Based on these experiences and the data that have been collected, I would suggest the following:

Professional development should

focus on the research-based concepts and evidence-based instruction rather than programs. While teachers must understand how the information presented in workshops can be integrated into their core curriculum using an RtI framework, they should also realize that there is no perfect program. One size does not fit all. They must learn to become method-proof.

Principals must be fully vested in this reading initiative. That means that, as the instructional leader, they will commit to releasing teachers from their classrooms, hold teachers accountable for rigorous data-driven instruction and implementation by monitoring their instruction, and meet regularly with the coach and the teachers on the teams.

All administrators must commit to the initiative. This means everyone makes this their first priority, signing agreements stating they will attend all sessions, commit to classroom assignments for the duration of

1 the grant, and meet with their colleagues.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

It must be a minimum of three years. It takes many years to turn around schools. And these have to be sustainable and long-term.

And just as teachers are held accountable for their students' success, those responsible for providing this PD will be accountable for the success of the initiatives. So, we must require schools to select performance measures to gauge the success of the initiative.

Rather than being pretty dull, I would like the PD to embody the practice of pedagogical discourse.

Thank you for your attention.

MR. CESARANO: I'm Michael

Cesarano from Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. I

just have a few things.

I want to thank you first for
inviting us here. I, in my position, have an

22 opportunity to go and visit schools and,

actually, to the classroom level.

So, my first request is more of an advocacy for them. And that is, as you develop your requirements for this grant, if you could include in that considerations that they are also dealing with requirements for other grants and other state and federal-level requirements that are basically passed down to them.

What they are dealing with is the fact that, although they may want to pursue a grant like this, it may actually have conflict with other requirements that they are presently under. And if that can be a consideration, I know that it is a difficult issue, but if that can be developed in a manner so that they can work alongside or be in addition to.

The second thing, also, is, as a publisher, we have been providing professional development to schools for probably as long as we have been around. And also, we do use

teachers that are highly-certified, teachers that are proven to be effective teachers. So, we do consider ourselves a partner in education with the LEAs and the schools.

And if the requirements for your professional development and guidance are included in the grant, we will be more than happy to adapt what we provide, so that we can provide it not only to the language arts teachers, but, as you guys have already identified, to the other core curriculum areas as well.

Thank you very much.

MS. LANDESMAN RAMEY: Hello. I'm Sharon Landesman Ramey, and I am from Georgetown University, where I direct the Center on Health and Education.

Three points: the first is I hope when you finalize the guidelines for the competition, you do whatever you can within the constraints of the congressional legislation to not pre-determine that every

subgrant within a state has a mandatory 15 percent for birth to 5; 40 percent, K to fifth grade; 40 percent, sixth grade to twelve.

I think the idea that all ages are vital to a successful birth-through-12 plan should be underscored, and that the applicants have to strongly defend where they are strategically investing the federal dollars based on need and the strengths of their local and state programs. So, I would like to avoid a prescriptive percentage that doesn't take into account particular needs and strengths.

No. 2, I think that the federal government is awfully good at having influence through very cohesive and strong documents that invite applications. And you have an amazing opportunity to influence and inspire our states by identifying core resource documents that summarize the research.

You have invested, for example, in a decade of research projects on early educator professional development. Summarize

what you have learned, tell them the documents, and in your Request for Applications have them refer to those documents, or if they are proposing something not endorsed by the documents, especially something counter to what's recommended, they have to defend it, as to why they are not doing what the research synthesis shows.

And thirdly, I would like evaluation to be elevated. Evaluation is still the "gotcha" tool. It is still all the high-stakes testing, all the negative stuff that comes.

I mean, what if this weren't called the Comprehensive Literacy Program -- and I am not suggesting renaming -- but what if it were called the Comprehensive Continuously Evaluated Literacy Program? It wouldn't be an after-thought. It wouldn't be something that, when you turn in your final report, you get it or you just hire some company and pay them a little bit, and they'll

1 write you the report.

I would like the idea of datadriven decisions, collecting data on students,
classrooms, teachers, principals, center
directors, to really be elevated and for
applicants to be held accountable. And I hope
that you will make it so that the data
collected from every state that gets one of
these awards quickly enters the public domain,
so we can really build.

We have too many examples where we invest a quarter of a billion dollars

-- that's what we're looking at, or maybe more because of what states contribute -- and 10 years down the road we haven't learned anything. So, please elevate the evaluation.

Thank you.

DR. MELENDEZ DE SANTA ANA: That's it. Deborah, did you want to close up and sort of give us the next steps?

Again, on my behalf, thank you very much for joining us today. Thank you.

1 MS. SPITZ: Thank you very much.

We had fewer public speakers than we had planned on. So, we have a little bit of time.

Is there anyone who wanted to make a public comment that didn't? I will offer that up as an opportunity.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Are you still having the afternoon session?

MS. SPITZ: We are, and we are going to break for what is now an extended lunch.

I also wanted, if the panelists

don't mind, if there is anyone out there that

has a question, we hadn't thought we would

have time to have the panel answer any

questions. But if people have a question, and

I think one of my colleagues does, if the

panel wouldn't mind being given a question or

two?

DR. MELENDEZ DE SANTA ANA: Two questions, I think.

Page 125 MS. SPITZ: Oh, yes, and, Dr. 1 2 Melendez, if you had any follow-up 3 questions --4 DR. MELENDEZ DE SANTA ANA: Oh, 5 no. Thanks. 6 MR. D'EMILIO: This is an 7 excellent panel, and I want to take advantage 8 of the opportunity to dig in a little bit more 9 about zero to 5 and the role that you perceive 10 parents can play, especially parents or caregivers or siblings and grandmothers in the 11 12 home where the language isn't English. 13 all groups, how do parents play a role? 14 would you specify that in the application? DR. MELENDEZ DE SANTA ANA: 15 16 you state your name for the panel? I know who 17 you are, but --18 (Laughter.) 19 Timothy D'Emilio, MR. D'EMILIO: 20 Office of English Language Acquisition. 21 DR. STRICKLAND: You know, when

you mentioned grandparents, that's close to my

22

heart for a lot of reasons. But one is the fact that many of these children are being raised by a grandparent.

So, whoever the caregiver is needs to be brought into the equation, no question about that. And there are ways to do this by embracing the parent as a part of the whole process, rather than to suggest that there's something wrong, that we need to fix you.

So, the professional development for the educators will really have to focus on, how do we not only reach out, how do we keep parents engaged in the process? The relationship between -- well, everybody in this room knows this -- the language of the home in those very early years and the achievement beyond is just startling.

Whenever you see those statistics, they stay in your mind for weeks and weeks and weeks.

So that, getting them started, helping educators know how to get them in and how to do things with parents that have

lasting impact will be very important. And there's literature out there on this. There's no question about it.

DR. KAMIL: I want to go a little further. And that is, we need professional development for these parents. It is a funny way to talk about it, but we need to actually teach them what kinds of things to do with the kids. We know lots of things to do, and yet, it doesn't get translated. So, some kind of school pattern, parent partnership, but almost conceived as a professional development.

One of the most impressive pieces is the work of using literacy objects as play objects, and yet, that gets done routinely in middle- and upper-class homes and not so much in lower-class homes. That would be an easy one for teachers to do. Dialogic and shared book reading would be another one. All of those could be done in a very quick way, but it needs to be a structured program.

DR. LESAUX: So, a couple other

things, just to add to that, especially with zero to 5 in mind. One challenge is that the education is the first time we are able to systematically reach all of the parents, or so we think.

But some of the interventional work that we have been doing in Massachusetts is really around community leaders, tapping faith-based leaders, and places where families gather, in order to get some of this information into some of these settings.

These are folks who often are regular attendees at different community-based institutions.

The second thing we have been doing is pushing on plans, and this is every school and district has a writeup about their family inclusion as part of their plans, some kind of family engagement. How can we better link that to learning?

So, one of the things, rather than how many parents came through the door, in

fact, a lot of the good research will tell you that is actually how you get achievement gains and very good family engagement work, but we rarely ask schools to measure their achievement gains as a function of family engagement events.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The last setting that I will say that we have been doing some work in is actually in home-based daycare, home-based Many of our immigrant early care settings. families use women in the neighborhood who have five or six children at their house. have been taking some of the early reading programs, and this is a generally isolated group of providers who don't get a lot of attention from the State, around a capabilitybuilding effort to get those who are exceptionally receptive to information and, of course, very oriented towards good support of parents.

So, if we can get those good traits and push a little on early literacy and

the talk campaigns, where we sort of talk and definitely talk in the native language in these settings to elevate quality. That is certainly a very untapped area.

Most of these children are not in central daycare, if you look at the State levels that we have looked at.

DR. STRICKLAND: I just wanted to add a little more to Michael's comment. It will require showing -- if people haven't been raised in homes where you just play with children on a natural basis and engage in language and do things, a zoo, the ordinary things, inexpensive things, where you actually talk about what you're seeing, if this isn't a part of your own upbringing, it isn't necessarily something you do with your own children.

So, there will be a question of showing, not just telling or giving handouts, and doing it in ways that are very respectful.

MS. LANDESMAN RAMEY: I would like

to ask about the role or the opportunity that you might see in this grant mechanism for states to consider gifted and talented vis-avis differentiated instruction and cultural, language, ethnic, and racial sensitivities. And specifically, this week I heard a principal get up and talk about his low-income children, some of whom are gifted and talented, but the ability to engage these students around third, fourth, fifth grade goes away. Many of our federal grants understandably focus on bringing lowachieving, striving readers up to average. But are we being insensitive when we don't realize that within all of our subgroups in the country, including kids in special ed, and so forth, we have some talented?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And it is like we just think,
well, they're already average or better; let
them go. I think it may disengage some
community and family effort from our low-

income and historically marginalized populations if gifted and talented cannot be mentioned.

So, what are your opinions about whether it could be included in a state plan or not?

DR. LESAUX: Well, the only thing
I will say is that they are certainly an atrisk population. If you look at their overall
outcomes, they are certainly in some ways at
risk.

And gifted and talented does not mean high level across the board. Many students who are classified as gifted and talented, in fact, show very uneven profiles within their academic performance, and many need a lot of work around that, inferential kinds of activities, perspective-taking, that kind of thing.

So, to that end, the data would suggest this is a group who needs to be certainly attended to.

DR. STRICKLAND: Differentiated

2 instruction properly should account for those

3 children. There is no question about that.

language learners.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And I worry about poor kids or kids from certain neighborhoods, automatically the assumption being that they are going to have trouble, and about English

The variability within any group is very, very great. And while as well, I'm sure, the others on the panel worry a lot about the kids who are struggling, and that is what the topic is here today, I think we also worry that teachers get the impression that certain groups are automatically -- and these are well-meaning teachers, teachers and administrators who want to do the right thing -- but the assumption is that these kids are going to have trouble anyway. And I struggle with this all the time. I don't know how this particular grant could account for that, but it is that variability.

The point is not to just look at a kid or know his surname and make assumptions.

This is a very important issue.

DR. KAMIL: Just in a pragmatic sense, I think if you take care of the struggling readers, what happens is you free up teachers to work with students who aren't struggling. So, it takes fewer classroom resources from the teacher, and so on. So, I think it has that side benefit, and I'm not sure that that is the focal point of this.

But, in fact, I want to second what Dorothy said. If you provide for classroom instruction -- that is where I started my remarks -- and it is of high quality, it is going to account for those differences among students, and that plan ought to be there.

DR. LESAUX: And that's why assessment has to go beyond children and move to the setting level. We have got to hold districts and states accountable for also

1 talking about the quality of their settings.

Because even in our own work in a large urban district, it is a bit of a lottery. You might move from one very good classroom to another the whole way up or not.

And so, we do need to pay attention to that, so that we aren't just thinking about kids who will struggle, but settings that don't promote development.

MS. SPITZ: I want to thank our panel again for this amazing discussion to take place.

And I also want to thank those of you who offered public comment, and those of you who are listening online this morning.

We are going to have a second session this afternoon. It runs from 1:00 to 4:00. We have kind of designed them as freestanding sessions, so you can attend one or both.

We will have speakers this afternoon that represent more of the state and

local perspective on these issues and, also,
a professor from the Curry School of Education
talking about the needs of students with
disabilities, but also there are literacy
issues as well.

The folks at the registration table have information, if you haven't received it, about what lunch options are in the area.

So, if you're coming back, please be back by 1:00.

And also, if you did want to submit a written statement, those need to be in to us today. So, they should be either submitted to somebody at the registration table or they can be emailed to the email address that was in our notice. Of course, you can ask me if you need more information.

And thank you very much.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record for lunch at 11:27 a.m. and went back on the record at 1:06 p.m.)

1 A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N
2 1:06 p.m.
3 MS. SPITZ: Good afternoon.
4 Thank you all for coming this
5 afternoon. I know some of you were here this
6 morning.
7 Since many of you were not, we are

going to try to run through the same opening that we did this morning. So some of you will hear a few of the same things over again. But we have a whole new panel with us and a new facilitator.

I run a group of reading programs at the Department of Education in the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.

We are here today to talk about the Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy Program. We have a lot to talk about. So, I want to get quickly to our facilitator and our experts.

And you will hear more in a minute about how the day is going to work, if you

have any questions about our agenda.

And if you need anything, the folks at the table from Synergy can help you out. So, don't hesitate to go out there and ask if you need something.

With that, I would like to introduce Dr. Carl Harris. He is going to be our facilitator for this afternoon.

Dr. Harris has been the Deputy
Assistant Secretary for Policy and State
Technical Assistance in the Office of
Elementary and Secondary Education at the
Department since January of this year.

Prior to his appointment, he was
the Superintendent of Durham Public Schools,
a District of 53 schools and nearly 33,000
students. Dr. Harris also served the District
as Deputy Superintendent and Assistant
Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction.

Dr. Harris also served for five years as the Superintendent of the Franklin County Public Schools, also in North Carolina.

Dr. Harris has been a classroom teacher, a coach, and a district administrator, as well as serving on numerous professional boards and leadership teams.

He has received many awards for his educational leadership, including the Central Carolina Regional Superintendent of the Year, the National Association for Gifted Children Educator Award, and the Franklin County Living Black Legend Award.

In 2008, he received the
University Council for Educational
Administration's Educational Leadership Award,
and is a graduate of the first class of the
Broad Superintendents Academy.

He received his doctorate in education administration from North Carolina State University. He also holds a master of arts in education, a master of administration, and an education specialist degree in administration and supervision.

So, we are very happy to have him

		Page	140
1	here facilitating our event.		
2	DR. HARRIS: Thank you, Deborah.		
3	Good afternoon.		
4	(Chorus of "Good afternoon" from		
5	audience members.)		
6	First of all, I would like to		
7	welcome you to the Department of Education.		
8	Thank you for joining us this afternoon. I		
9	want you to know it is a great pleasure and		
10	honor for me to serve as your facilitator.		
11	As you all know, the purpose of		
12	this public hearing is to gather expertise and		
13	input from the public on the development of a		
14	grant competition under the Striving Readers		
15	Comprehensive Literacy Program.		
16	We at the Department take these		
17	meetings very seriously, and your input will		
18	be critical to our work on this program for		
19	the next year.		
20	Excuse me for a minute. A little		
21	technical difficulty.		
22	(Pause.)		

As I mentioned earlier, we take these hearings very serious, and your input will be critical to support us in our decisionmaking.

I want to preface this meeting by saying that I know that literacy is a broad-ranging and deeply-complex topic. And I also want to say that in no way do we anticipate that we can cover all the areas around literacy in this brief time that we have together this afternoon.

But I would like to say to you
that we do have some excellent experts here
who are with us this afternoon who bring to us
a range of expertise, who will discuss
literacy as it relates to a variety of
different priorities, including increasing the
achievement of English learners and students
with disabilities.

I also look forward to hearing your input, your ideas, and your feedback on this important program.

So, at this time, I am going to turn it back over to Deborah, who leads our literacy effort in the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, to give you a overview of the Striving Readers Comprehension Literacy Program.

Deborah?

MS. SPITZ: I'm going to go through this fairly quickly. We wanted to give this to you as a handout, so you would have the information.

Mostly what I am going to talk about in a brief few minutes is what's in the statutory language for the Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy Program. So, while we are here to ask your input on a variety of topics, the things that I am going to talk about are pretty much program requirements.

So, basically, the goal of the program is to build comprehensive literacy systems in states. And this program is different from our other literacy programs in

at least two key ways.

The first and the biggest

difference, I think, is that it is a birth-tograde-12 program, which we haven't done in the

past. We have focused on specific age ranges.

So, serving birth to grade 12 is a challenge

for states. It is a challenge for districts

and early learning providers. But I think

this program is definitely a way to focus

attention on the needs of children at all of

these very important age ranges.

The second way that this program is different is that there is a small formula piece of it that goes to all states, and that goes to states to develop comprehensive literacy plans. And then, there is a large competitive component to the program, which is mostly what we are going to talk about today.

This is just a breakout of how the funding is set aside. The formula grants that I just referenced, those recently went out to states. Most states received \$150,000. So,

we are not talking about a lot of money.

Again, these are essentially planning grants. They are grants for states to either develop state literacy teams or enhance the state literacy teams they have, and to use those teams of experts to develop or enhance, because many states have some kind of comprehensive literacy plan. So, this allows them to build on that because most states don't have a birth-to-grade-12 comprehensive literacy plan.

And the plans, again, need to address the needs of children from birth to grade 12, but particularly those students who are English language learners and students with disabilities.

The competitive grants piece,
which is the larger piece of the funds, it
will be competed to states. So, states are
the eligible entities. We hope from this
meeting we are gathering information to
finalize basically what our application will

look like, and when we issue an application, we hope that then states will apply in the spring, and we will make awards in the summer to fall.

A key piece of this program is that the states that do receive funds under this competitive grant will need to make competitive subgrants. This is the language around what those subgrants must do.

They must fund services that have the characteristics of effective literacy instruction through professional development, screening and assessment, targeted interventions for students reading below grade level, and other research-based methods of improving classroom instruction and practice.

And this is an important part of that. These are the requirements by law in how states must award these funds. So, they may use up to 5 percent for state leadership and administration activities, and they must award at least 95 percent of the funding to

LEAs and early childhood providers.

And at the state level, it has to fall within these percentages: up to 15 percent for birth to pre-K, 40 percent for grades K to five, and 40 percent for grades six to twelve, with an equitable distribution between middle and high school. Again, this is in the statute.

I am not going to read this, but just be aware that the eligible entities for these subgrants, when states hold their competitions, for most of the grants the eligible entity will be an LEA. But in the case of early literacy, there is this definition of who else might be eligible. And it talks about early learning providers and partnerships between LEAs and public and private entities.

And basically, I talked about this a little bit. So, our timeline is we just awarded the formula funds, and states are right now in the process of developing these

a little bit more about that from our panel.

Then, we will publish a notice inviting applications. States can use whatever they are developing with their literacy teams. Even if it is in raw form, they can use that to develop their application for this competition. And then, they will apply. Then, we hope to award grants by August.

And with that, I am going to turn things back to Carl Harris.

DR. HARRIS: Let me briefly walk you through the agenda for the rest of this afternoon.

We will begin the expert
presentations and panel shortly, which our
expert guests will give us a presentation.

The presentations will be followed by a short
discussion with our expert panel here on the
stage from the Department of Education.

Afterwards, we will open up the

1 floor to public speakers to provide input.

Prior to the public input, we will break for a five-minute recess, to give each of you an opportunity to have a short break.

And then, we will come back and we will have the public comments. This will be an opportunity for each of you from the public who have registered to give your statement for the record.

Now let me briefly just reiterate the goals for this meeting. First, this meeting is to help us develop a notice in writing applications that requires states to develop high-quality proposals that will result in increased student achievement.

One way to develop a high-quality notice is by providing time to the public to provide input to this program. As I mentioned earlier, this is very important for us.

We also hope that our meeting will help paint a vision for what a comprehensive literacy program could and should look like at

the state and the local level.

This meeting is an opportunity for the Ed staff to receive expert public guidance in response to guestions asked in the notice.

Just a few more brief points to set expectations for the meeting. We are on a tight time schedule, as you can see on our screen. So, once again, we want to maximize the time so that we have an opportunity for public input.

We will be keeping time, so that our speakers know when their start time and finish time is available.

And finally, just a quick reminder, if you do have a cell phone, we do ask that you put it on vibrate or turn it off.

Each of you should have received a copy of this presentation. So, you will have our contact information and instructions on how to access a transcript of this session online.

Now it is my pleasure to introduce

our experts and panel members that you will hear from today.

Our first panel member, Dr. Paige
Pullen. Dr. Paige Pullen is an Associate
Professor in Special Education at the
University of Virginia and a nationallyrecognized expert in the field of learning
disabilities and early literacy development.

Dr. Pullen is the Coordinator of Special Programs at the University of Virginia. She received a bachelor's degree in elementary education from the University of Florida in 1988, followed by a master's in early childhood education in 1990 and a Ph.D. in special education in 2000, both from the University of Florida.

Dr. Pullen has also co-authored several books, including the latest version of the widely-used Exceptional Learner, 11th edition, with co-authors Daniel Hallahan and James Kauffman; Students with Learning Disabilities with co-authors Cecil Mercer,

1 Teaching Students with Learning Disabilities

2 and Phonological Awareness Assessment and

3 Instruction: a Sound Beginning.

disabilities.

She has also published numerous
book chapters for students at risk for school
failures and with identified learning

Dr. Jill Slack. Dr. Slack is

Director of Literacy at the Louisiana

Department of Education, where she plays the

lead role in the day-to-day administration and

implementation of the State's literacy

efforts, including the management of

Louisiana's Striving Readers Project, a

federal grant aimed at improving the reading

skills of adolescent students who are reading

below grade level.

Dr. Slack is also leading the development of Louisiana's Comprehensive Literacy Plan. Recently, Dr. Slack served on the State's Education Reform Team, and she coauthored Louisiana's Race to the Top proposal.

Prior to joining the Department in September of 2008, Dr. Slack was a Project Director for SEDL, where she designed and provided training and ongoing support to state, local, and intermediate agencies in reading, writing, and school improvement strategies.

Over the years, Dr. Slack has also served as a reading specialist, administrator, and classroom teacher in a large public school system. She has also been an ESL instructor, a research site trainer, and program evaluator for the Accelerated School Project and an assistant professor in higher education.

Wynne Tye. Wynne currently serves as the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction in Hillsborough County Public Schools, located in Tampa, Florida. HCPS, as her District is known as, is the eighth largest district in the nation.

Ms. Tye graduated from the
University of South Florida and began her

teaching career in Hillsborough County in 1981, where she taught severe, profoundly mentally-handicapped students for nine years.

Ms. Tye received her master's degree from the University of South Florida in educational leadership and became an assistant principal in 1990. She was appointed principal of the Walker Middle School in 2002, followed by a promotion to the General Director of Middle Education in 2004. And prior to her appointment as the Assistant Superintendent in 2008, Ms. Tye also served the District as General Director of the Exceptional Student Education.

Ms. Tye is the recipient of the 13th Annual Praeceptor Distinguished Service Award and the Dr. Earl Lennard Leadership Award.

In addition to our expert
speakers, as you all know, you met Deborah
Spitz, who will serve as our Department
expert, along with Dr. Jacqueline Jones, who

is the Senior Advisor to the Secretary for Early Learning.

So, at this time, I would like to turn it over to our expert presenters.

Dr. Pullen?

DR. PULLEN: Good afternoon.

I am happy to be here today and very honored that I was asked. So, thank you to Deborah for calling and inviting me here today.

I am going to talk a little bit about what a comprehensive reading program might look like, but, more specifically, what the needs of students with disabilities may be; as we develop these comprehensive reading programs, that we make sure we are considering the needs of kids with disabilities or those children who are at risk for disabilities.

So, when we think about a comprehensive reading program, one of our first questions, we know that ultimately what we want is for kids to gain sound reading

comprehension, that they are able to gain meaning from print. So, the ultimate goal of reading instruction is reading comprehension.

However, we have multiple influences on reading comprehension. That may be our ultimate goal, but how do we get there?

So, this conceptual framework shows a little bit of how complex the reading process is and all of the different influences that will affect reading comprehension.

So, as you are developing comprehensive reading programs, some of the things that you will be considering are those early language experiences. So, early language experiences, we know that those experiences are going to form the foundation for what will end up being a child's success or perhaps failure, once they move into early formal reading instruction.

So, in our comprehensive programs, we want to make sure that we are addressing the needs of young children who are at risk

for disabilities and make sure that we provide a solid foundation, so that kids can benefit from formal reading instruction, once they do reach school age.

So, after we have made sure that we have included that early language/early home literacy, that we are not starting in first grade or second grade; we are starting before kids ever get to school. Then, we think, okay, now they are in preschool; what can we do?

Well, then, we think about the pathway from those early foundational skills to reading comprehension. One of the influences we know on later reading comprehension is phonemic awareness. We know that phonemic awareness is going to help children be able to decode, and that being able to decode will help children gain reading fluency. And that once they have gained reading fluency, they will be able to, hopefully, understand what it is that they are

1 reading.

So, we can make sure that our preschool programs have sound programs in phonemic awareness and print awareness, that we are focusing on letter knowledge, making sure we are developing those foundational skills. So that, once they get to school age, that they are able to benefit from phonics instruction and learn those decoding skills. So, we know that those pieces are going to be in place.

We know that, for children, once they have learned how to decode, that they have to learn how to decode at a level of automaticity. It is not enough that they learn how to decode, but they have to learn to decode so automatically that they are able to read fluently.

Reading fluency is highly correlated with reading comprehension. So, we know that the comprehensive reading program, that we are going to have fluency instruction

1 in place.

And then, you think, well, we have done it all. We have done phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency. We have focused on early language. But, then, we have all of these other pieces as well.

We have vocabulary and background knowledge. We want to make sure that throughout school, from early childhood all the way through high school, that we are focusing on vocabulary, breadth and depth of word knowledge. So, we will make sure that those pieces are in place.

We hope that we will provide children lots of rich experiences to develop background knowledge, but that our instruction will not stop at providing background knowledge, that we will actually teach kids how to think before they read and how to activate that background knowledge, and how to think about what types of text structures they might be reading, and how that might

influence. So, we will teach activation of background knowledge and knowledge of text structures.

So, all of these pieces are going to go into a comprehensive reading program, and that leaves us with reading comprehension.

So, if we do all of that, will kids be able to understand what they are reading?

Well, we know that we do a lot of assessment in reading comprehension, but we don't necessarily do a lot of instruction in reading comprehension. So, throughout school from elementary and on into high school, we need to make sure that we are focusing on teaching strategies to help children gain meaning from print and focus on reading comprehension strategies.

So, do you think that is enough influences on reading comprehension and reading success? It is a fairly complex process, but there are more influences. There are perhaps some influences that may be more

specific to kids with disabilities or at risk for disabilities. And we cannot get into all of those today, but we will focus primarily in this talk on kids with learning disabilities.

Well, let's look at what some of those might be. So, we have reading comprehension. We know there are all of those other multiple influences on reading comprehension. What else might come into play?

We know that kids with reading disabilities and learning disabilities generally often have working memory issues, phonological short-term memory. That is going to affect reading comprehension, learning how to decode at a level of automaticity, and many of the other influences on reading comprehension. So, working memory capacity may be specific to kids with disability in terms of how we have to intervene.

Metacognitive abilities. Skilled readers understand when they do and when they

don't understand. Unskilled readers think
often of reading as word calling because they
have had to focus so much on decoding, that
they forget the real purpose of reading. And
they read and sometimes don't even realize
when they have made an error.

So, the difference between a skilled reader and an unskilled reader sometimes focuses on this issue related to metacognitive, being aware of your own thought processes, being able to monitor and crosscheck your reading, and make sure that you understand when and when you aren't comprehending.

There are also deficits that kids can have rapid automatized naming, another deficit that is going to impact reading fluency.

And there are factors related to interest and motivation. For kids with disabilities, many of these children have faced repeated failure, and if you repeatedly

fail at something, you are probably not going to be very likely to select that as something that you want to do.

We have to make sure that we provide opportunities for children with disabilities to succeed and create instruction for them that guarantees that they move from one step to another, and that we don't allow them to lose interest and motivation.

So, that is going to bring me to we have got all these influences on reading comprehension. We know the different types of deficits that students can have. What in a comprehensive reading program should we focus on? Should we focus on remediation? Should we focus on prevention? Or should we focus on prevention?

In a comprehensive districtwide or statewide model, we would want to have all three of these pieces in place. So, remediation refers to the process of correcting a deficiency. There will be some

children who have already experienced failure, and we need to have a plan for those children, those students, so that we can remediate and help them come up-to-speed in their reading skills.

Intervention refers to the process of coming into or between, so as to hinder or alter an action, so really to stop failure.

Now the good news is that we know so much more about reading instruction that we do know how in the early years to intervene early and perhaps prevent some disability, some identification of learning disabilities, because we have provided intervention early, or reading failure.

Prevention is the process of keeping something from happening. So, we also want to have prevention in place. So, prevention may be that early instruction, beginning from birth to age 5, where we focus on what's happening in homes and making a link between, a transition between early childhood

and schooling; intervention through outschooling, where when we notice a problem, we
don't wait for the problem to get too bad; we
intervene early, step in, provide evidencebased instruction. And for kids who have
already met with failure, that we don't give
up on those children, but we provide
opportunities to remediate the deficits that
they have. So, we want to have a plan of
remediation, intervention, and prevention in
our comprehensive literacy programs.

I am going to go through these next slides quickly. This is something that you have all seen in terms of thinking about that cycle of assessing and diagnosing, teaching, having students practice and applying in real reading, and then reassessing and reteaching.

But I wanted to equate, as we look back to this idea of remediation, intervention, and prevention, we see at the bottom of the slide a check engine light, a

service engine soon, you know the lights on a car. If we think about this idea of remediation, intervention, and prevention from maintaining a car, we can think of this cycle of assessment, teaching, and reteaching.

So, we are going to assess and diagnose by making sure that we evaluate what's going on with our car. We are not going to wait until the car runs out of oil and need to replace the engine, right?

Hopefully, what we will do is we will check the oil. We will assess whether the oil is low. If it is low, then we are going to add oil. We are going to intervene, and we are not going to wait for the engine to fail.

The same can be thought of for the prevention and intervention of reading disabilities. We are going to assess and diagnose. Based on that assessment and diagnosis, we will intervene and provide instruction that matches the student's needs.

We will practice with them and

help them apply those strategies that we have taught them, based on our intervention and our assessment. Then, we will make sure that they have actually learned what it is that we have taught.

So, step one is to gather data.

What are the student's strengths and
weaknesses? We may use standardized tests,
informal measures, and teacher observations.

This is kind of like checking the engine.
We're checking the oil.

The next step would be to provide direct, explicit instruction in the strategy, skill, or process the student needs based on the assessment that we have conducted. We will want to model the skill and provide direct explanation.

If it is a student who has repeatedly failed at something, had a difficult time learning something, we want to ensure success. To do that, we are going to start out with "Let me show you how to do it,"

a lot of explicit teaching and modeling.

We move from that explicit teaching and modeling from "Let me show you how to do it" to "Let me help you do it." So, we provide multiple opportunities for the students to use what has been taught.

We begin with practice that provides a significant teacher support, and we move to more independent practice. So, "Let me show you how to do it." "Let me help you do it." "Now you do it." So, that's the practice.

We also want to make sure that we don't stop there, that students need to understand how to implement those strategies and skills in real reading, in connected text. So, the student applies the skill learned in real reading. We continue to gather observational data about the child's use of the strategy during reading, and keeping in mind that the goal is to have the student use the strategy independently on his or her own.

their own.

make sure that we are promoting generalization in the skills that we teach. Many kids can be taught something, and they immediately know how to make that generalization. Kids with disabilities often need more explicit instruction to see how that connects to real reading and writing. And we want to help show

So, we need to think of a way to

reading and writing. And we want to help show them what that connection is. They are not going to make a generalization necessarily on

So, then, we reassess and start the teaching cycle over. Has the student learned what you have provided through direct instruction? So, we assess during the teaching and practice opportunities and we assess following teaching opportunities to see that the student has learned what we have taught.

We continually use that data to make decisions. We reteach the skill if it was not mastered or we teach the new skill or

strategy that is appropriate in a systemized instructional sequence.

So, that is how we would go
through the cycle of teaching and reteaching,
but how do we consider these multiple
influences on reading comprehension in terms
of what we should assess or diagnose? So,
what do I assess, diagnose, and teach?

We know from all of the multiple influences on reading comprehension that oral language has to be a piece of what it is that we teach, assess, diagnose, and teach. Print awareness is another important factor in a comprehensive literacy program.

Phonemic awareness, and if you'll notice, this little boy is holding his ears.

So, phonemic awareness is an understanding of the sound structure of language, is specific to sound, nothing to do with letters. And we want to make sure that we have phonemic awareness.

We want to teach word recognition,

which includes high-frequency sight words as well as decoding strategies, reading fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. These are the reading skills of a skilled reader, and you will see in this chain everything is linked together.

If everything is linked together and there aren't any breaks in the chain, then everything is going to work well. But if you have one link broken, then the reading process falls apart. What we need to do is make sure we know where that broken link is and intervene before the chain falls apart.

So, where do I begin intervention? You are going to assess and diagnose, and you are going to select the lowest skill in the hierarchy of reading development, move systematically through the hierarchy, keeping in mind that students are building skills simultaneously. So, even though in this ladder it is shown as a hierarchy, it is not separate rungs where they are not connected.

1 They are connected.

So, if students are failing to achieve phonemic awareness, that is where the intervention needs to take place. If they are failing at the decoding point or having deficits in decoding, that is where we need to intervene, and so on and so forth, up the ladder.

I think for older readers one of the concerns is that we often think that we automatically need to implement in fluency and comprehension and preventions, but, in fact, the breakdown is usually more at the bottom of the ladder, skills in phonemic awareness, letter knowledge, and phonemic decoding. And we need to make sure that, even for our older readers, we are intervening in the right place.

So, what do the teachers need to know? They need to understand the reading process, know how to assess each key area of reading, understand the framework for the

prevention and intervention of reading disabilities, and possess the knowledge and skills to implement multiple strategies for intervention and prevention.

Now how can states and districts support children at risk for disabilities? I want to quickly tell you the story about Eve. Eve is a young child. She is in second grade, and she has a learning disability.

Eve struggled with reading from the time she was in kindergarten. She is a bright, young girl who comes from a very educated family with both parents -- one parent is a high school teacher; the other parent has a Ph.D. in education. So, we are talking about someone who has had many, many opportunities to learn before she got to school.

But she began struggling with literacy in kindergarten. In first grade, Eve was provided two days of intensive support from August to January. Could we call that

tier 2? Okay.

Then, she was provided two additional days of intensive support from January to May. Maybe tier 3?

Then, she attended summer school and private tutoring, still struggling. At the beginning of second grade, Eve received two days of additional support. Back to tier 2.

The school district denied the parents a full evaluation for a learning disability quoting, "Special education is a detriment to children" and "There's no such thing as special education for students with learning disabilities anymore."

So, what can we do as districts and states to support children at risk for disabilities? We can provide early and intensive support for children at risk for reading disabilities. We can implement excellent tier 1 instruction to all children through a comprehensive literacy program. We

can identify children who need extra support and provide evidence-based instruction through increasingly intensive instruction, RtI.

However, we don't stop there and leave kids in tier 2 instruction when they may be identified. We provide full evaluations for students who have expected disabilities, and we continue with that excellent evidence-based instruction for children identified with disabilities and follow an individualized education program.

We also advocate for children and youth with disabilities to ensure that we continue to consider their rights to a free and appropriate public education with supports and accommodations as needed.

So, thank you for considering the rights of Eve and the many children who struggle with learning disabilities. And I invite you to teach well. And there's my email, if you have questions later.

Thank you.

1 (Applause.)

DR. SLACK: Good afternoon.

I would like to thank Deborah and the Department of Education for inviting me to be part of this panel to discuss the critical components of statewide literacy plans, as well as some considerations to take into account in addressing the needs of diverse learners.

I would like to start by sharing with you this visual representation that highlights Louisiana's vision for improving literacy in our State that includes the key concepts and words in our plan for improving literacy that have also brought clarity to our efforts in Louisiana, and have also engaged those who were once not engaged.

So, my talk is going to emphasize the core components that we believe should be in a comprehensive literacy plan to create substantial improvements for literacy for all learners, especially disadvantaged children,

limited-English-proficient children, as well as children with disabilities.

What we have found through our review of the research and policies and promising practices on literacy, we found five interconnected core components that are critical to a comprehensive literacy plan in the State.

The first is leadership and sustainability. Creating literacy teams and plans for organizing, implementing, and sustaining effective approaches to birth-through-grade-12 literacy. We know that through research, research has shown that positive student learning outcomes start with strong leadership committed to a quality literacy plan. So, leadership and sustainability is upfront and center in our plan.

We have also learned from our

Reading First experiences that sustainability

needs to be addressed as a forethought or from

the onset of an effort, and not after a

program has begun. We feel that leadership is

key to ensuring that sustainability occurs.

So, we have paired leadership and

sustainability together.

A second component is standards-based curriculum, examining the State standards, the grade-level expectation and curriculum frameworks through the lens of literacy.

In an effective comprehensive literacy plan, teachers translate the standards and curriculum goals into lessons that integrate literacy tasks across the curriculum and throughout the day. Every content area, as Michael Kamil mentioned this morning, and every non-academic kind of text as well, has its own vocabulary, formats, conventions, and ways of understanding the words on a page.

So, if we are going to improve student outcomes, teachers need knowledge to

integrate reading and writing and speaking and listening, as well as critical thinking skills in all content areas.

A comprehensive assessment system is also a critical component for improving literacy instruction. And key to meeting this goal is accurate, timely assessment that allows teachers to use data to differentiate instruction according to individual student needs.

In our plan, comprehensive assessment practices to support effective instruction include both assessment of learning and assessment for learning, both formative and summative assessment. And the plan provides schools and districts with guidance on identifying and using valid and reliable managers to screen progress, monitor, and diagnose literacy needs to target instruction for each grade level and each age span, birth through grade 12.

A fourth component is instruction

and intervention. This is our RtI framework in Louisiana, which also includes the connection to assessment.

In our plan, high-quality instruction and intervention is key to improving the literacy achievement of all students. This piece in our plan addresses several factors that Dr. Pullen spoken about just a few minutes ago, including the key skill areas that children need to be proficient in, phonological awareness, decoding, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension, and writing.

Motivation is also addressed in this part of our plan as well as collaborative learning, and explicit, intentional instruction is key in this part of our plan.

And the fifth component, fifth and final, but it is equally important, is that of professional learning and resources. In our plan, professional learning is used as a broad term to mean formal professional development

as well as those efforts, job-embedded efforts, such as studying lesson plans, using data to drive instruction, examining student work, or tools for self-reflection.

So, developing learning
opportunities, web resources, and coordinated
support services, both within and outside of
the school that include community-based
organizations as well as families. This piece
also includes professional development for
parents. I think a speaker this morning
mentioned the importance of not just
professional development and learning for
teachers, but parents and families as well.

Also, in this piece of our plan, we include specific actions for working with institutions of higher education, so that they know what is in our State plan, so that they can better prepare teacher candidates to work with students when they do become practicing teachers. So, we have a strong connection with institutions of higher education and

teacher preparation programs in our State in this component, as well as links to other components in our plan.

So, what are the roles and capacities of states to help implement a statewide comprehensive literacy plan, not just at the State level, but at the LEA level to assist schools?

One key role is for the State to review the research on program and strategy effectiveness, and we have done that in developing the current plan that we have in place, but continually reviewing that research and using that research to inform improvements in our plan.

Also, setting high expectations and providing guidelines and oversight to ensure strong implementation. An important message to convey here is that literacy cuts across all curriculum, and we are doing our best to convey that message across the whole spectrum. It is not easy. What we find is

that literacy is sometimes in competition with other content areas. So, we are conveying the importance that we are not in competition with anything else, that literacy should be driving all reform efforts in the school.

And it is very closely connected, as a matter of fact, to the school improvement plan. So, in our plan itself, we do a fairly good job of articulating and working with districts and schools to understand this isn't something separate; it is something that you should already be doing, and that many of these components are already aligned with your school improvement efforts.

Disseminating materials,
resources, and tools that prepare teachers to
deliver high-quality instruction, not just for
those who may be part of this program and be
successful in receiving funds to implement
SRCL, but also to everybody in the State. We
realize these funds may not reach everybody,
but how can we provide these materials and

distribute these materials and resources and tools so that we prepare teachers across the entire State?

As well as providing technical assistance and support to implement these core components, and I will talk in a few slides down the way a little bit more about how we do that in Louisiana.

Target intensive support for schools with the greatest needs. We at the State department cannot provide targeted assistance to every school in the State. So, we do an analysis of the data to determine which schools would benefit from our services the most, and provide targeted assistance, but not ignoring those schools that also may not be at the lowest end of the achievement scale, but targeting intensive support to those that greatly need it the most.

Also, helping schools and districts use data systems to track student performance and identify areas of need, design

policies, and evaluate impact. One effort
that we are currently involved in is
developing our statewide longitudinal data
system to better track students, and not just
students, but teachers as well, and what is
going on in districts and schools, and
creating reporting mechanisms to eliminate the
burden of schools and districts creating those
reports themselves. So, the data systems to
track student performance as well as teacher
effectiveness is something that we are working
on very deliberately right now.

coaches, interventionists, speech/language pathologists, as well as library media specialists, and appraisal staff in the school to support literacy efforts. So that it is not just the classroom teacher or the reading specialist or the interventionist, but that it is a broad approach, and that these folks with expertise also serve on the literacy improvement team or the school improvement

team -- we use those terms synonymously in Louisiana -- but that it builds on expertise of all of these folks.

Developing a pipeline of strong leaders and teachers, and creating, for example, to incentivize and recruit and retain effective leaders and teachers in these districts. When we say "effective", we mean those teachers and leaders that are able to produce results based on student achievement data.

Now here is one way or one example of a role we played to promote data collection and utilization and provide responsive, timely feedback. This Literacy Capacity Survey that we created is linked to the components in our plan, and we have found this to be very critical and crucial to the implementation of our plan.

We ask teachers and leaders to complete this survey. This is just a sample of the first two components of items. It is

not so important for you to see the exact items, but for you to know that a Literacy Capacity Survey is important and can help inform efforts, and that that capacity survey should be linked to the comprehensive literacy plan in your states.

We wanted to create something that was innovative. We didn't want to create just another survey where teachers would say, "Just another survey to complete?", but that would actually inform changes in your thinking. And it worked really, really well.

The way that the teachers and leaders completed this form, it engaged them in conversations when they received the results back. We summarized the results for them, once again eliminating the burden for them to do so. We summarized the results and provided some recommendations, and at the same time we also encouraged them to analyze the results and recommendations that we suggested for them, to have engaging conversations about

how to improve certain areas of their own literacy efforts. So, it helped them narrow their focus on components or features of their own literacy efforts that they should and need to improve.

Their thinking, as they engaged in completing this survey over time, because they completed it some locations more than once, their thinking on the terms that are within here because the terms could mean different things to different folks, and that was okay with us in the beginning. But the bigger picture was getting them engaged in conversations to talk about those elements that, once again, extended their learning and understanding of what a quality literacy effort looks like.

So, in all, this literacy capacity survey was an instructional tool for us. It wasn't at first, but what we did soon come to discover, it is an instructional tool for the site because it actually got them engaged in

what was in our plan upfront by completing the literacy survey.

So, how can this program support transition to the common standards? Well, one way is to ensure that the comprehensive literacy plan addresses the concepts and skills in the Common Core Standards. And as Dr. Kamil mentioned this morning, reading and writing in content areas differ. So, the Common Core Standards do a very good job of addressing that issue.

Adapting high-quality instructional materials that align to the standards, and helping districts and schools adopt those instructional materials as well.

Provide professional development and in-class support to help teachers implement the standards. We are in the process right now of creating some awareness sessions to help teachers understand what it is they will be expected to teach when the Common Core Standards do roll out and how does

that compare to what they are currently teaching in the classrooms.

Educate parents and community
members on the purpose, aim, and content of
the standards, not just teachers, but
community outreach to help others understand
these content standards.

Embed progress monitoring on the standards and make data, once again, available to drive continuous improvement. Make resources readily available online as well to all educators.

Finally, in meeting the needs of diverse learners, some considerations to take into account, and that we are, indeed, doing in Louisiana, is to include a comprehensive learning support system that addresses classroom-based approaches, family and community engagement in interventions that facilitate literacy and learning with accommodations for limited-English-proficient students, children with disabilities, and

disadvantaged students as well.

Another way we are meeting the needs of diverse learners is in our plan we do provide clear actionable steps in our plan that address the needs of diverse learners, so that teachers can see a progression for meeting these needs. In our plan, for example, we have action steps that fall under one of four progressions. That is, beginning a plan, beginning to implement, expanding emphasis, and sustaining the plan. So, we have clear actions underneath each of those categories to assist schools and districts.

Recommend resources that provide guidance and support; for example, differentiated instructional strategies; technology tools, as someone mentioned this morning; assistive technology tools to help meet the needs of diverse learners, and multisensory approaches.

Also, not just extended time for learning, but extended opportunities for

learning as well, and not just after-school programs, but educationally-rich after-school programs and summer learning for these students.

Ensure that professional development is tied to enhancing teacher capacity and tied and linked to their specific needs, so that that professional learning that teachers are engaged in is specific and tailored to their needs.

information reports about these children. We are, once again, doing that through our longitudinal data system, once again eliminating the burden typically placed on districts and schools.

And one other way we are doing that is we are looking very carefully at what we have asked districts and schools to do previously and what we will be asking them to do, and streamlining that effort across all lines, once again, to eliminate burden.

So, I think that is it. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MS. TYE: Good afternoon.

And I would like to echo the sentiments my colleagues have said all day, all morning. It is a real pleasure, and I want to thank Deborah and the Department for inviting me here to participate in this panel.

They saved, I guess, the practitioner's voice for last. Because, as you heard from Dr. Harris, I'm a school-based person at heart. So, I am going to share a little bit perhaps a different perspective as we look at this initiative and, hopefully, can add to the comments that my colleagues have shared all day.

I think that one of the things
that was very, very clear in all the
presentations is that this is all about
connections. It is a deliberate,
collaborative effort across the state, the

district, the school, and the classroom to ensure that we have a high-quality reading instructional program.

And so, as we look at our instructional program, we know that it has to be a cohesive system that involves the dynamic interplay between assessment, teaching, and effective student learning. It maintains as a priority a focus upon student development of the reading process, yet, simultaneously, a focus upon the development of reading comprehension.

To accommodate both of these goals from grade pre-K for us through grade 12, although I know we are going to birth through 12, the content of reading instruction needs to be comprehensive in its scope. And so, there is a numerous number of reading components that must comprise a student's daily instruction. And I have heard throughout the day many of those components are similar across all the different plans and

proposals that some of these experts have shared with us.

Decisions regarding instruction

for each of the essential components are

systematically guided by a set of tangible

assessments -- so we need those assessments -
and data to guide what our instruction is.

And it needs to reflect the extent of the

student learning in each one of those

components. So, it needs to be connected.

You can tell I am not as technology-savvy as my colleagues here.

I am going to talk a little bit about Florida's literacy plan. I feel blessed to be a part of this State that has some very rich infrastructure that really assists the districts in looking at all aspects of instruction, but particularly we are going to talk about literacy.

And we believe, as many of you do, that the key to effective literacy, no matter what that looks like in your district, in your

state, is effective teaching. We have to look at what is going on in the classroom and what supports are we providing.

So, to provide support for our teachers, what the State provides for the districts to use is a structure for leadership that allows us to constantly monitor and look at what is happening in our comprehensive plan. They provide resources to all the districts that is available to us to access as we need to, based on our structure and district.

There is an infrastructure in the State of Florida for data collection that I think is much richer than many other states out there. We have the ability to look at our data, the formative assessments, across all different levels and make some very informed instructional decisions as a result.

The State offers a systematic professional development opportunity that we can access either through resources or through

actually tapping the State. And that systematic professional development is based on the data that we see and what is it that our teachers and our students need. So, it is prescribed. It is very focused, depending upon what that data is showing us.

We have easy access to reading research. And I am going to show you another slide, some specific structured supports that the State provides for the districts.

We have clear student achievement goals that are embedded in our State literacy plan. And again, we are using the data analysis to help us drive the decisionmaking at the district levels.

So, let's talk specifically about those State support structures. As I indicated earlier, we have a robust State infrastructure for data. We are looking now, as we are blessed to be a part of the Race to the Top, to further enhance that infrastructure. In the districts we know what

a great, powerful tool it is, but is it giving us the data that we want? So, we are really looking at enhancing that infrastructure to be more specific to our needs. That is ongoing now.

The State has the Florida Center for Reading Research, which allows us that access to reading research. It is a key to what we do in the districts. So, when we are looking at materials that we need to purchase, we are looking at how we are rolling out our comprehensive reading plan. That is a resource for us.

We have a formative assessment that the State puts out called the Florida

Assessment for Instruction in Reading, the FAIR assessment, that districts have the ability to tap into. I would tell you that, overwhelmingly -- we are in our second year of FAIR -- the assessment, it is three times a year. It is done online. And every single student in every single one of our schools --

and I have 250 in the District of Hillsborough

2 County -- access this formative assessment.

We are finding some great correlation to our State assessment, and it has been a wonderful instructional tool for us.

We had, prior to FAIR, and we still are using, the Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network, which is another assessment system that allows us to make good instructional decisions based on data, and, of course, like many of the states, provides us some great supports around response to intervention, RtI, what those interventions are, and helping us with establishing them, and then supporting that throughout.

I am going to talk a little bit more now about how it looks like in the District. So, I wanted to paint for you what I am able to avail myself as a District instructional leader.

We have a comprehensive reading

plan that every district is required to write and present to the State, but it is tailored to the needs of each one of our districts.

The State of Florida is comprised of 67 county school districts. So, as Dr. Harris when he introduced me indicated, we are the eighth largest district in the country, but the third largest in the State of Florida, serving over 192,000 students.

So, my comprehensive reading plan is going to look very, very different than other colleagues in the State because we are of all different sizes and shapes.

Hillsborough County has approximately 56 percent of its student body that qualify for free and reduced lunch. So, we are a very unique district in the fact that we are urban, suburban, and rural all in one district county.

So, when we are looking at our comprehensive reading plan, the four key elements that the State outlines in its

structure are centered around the bullets that I have in front of you.

District leadership, it's a required element in our plan. How are we in the District going to support the efforts that our schools are embarking on in this comprehensive reading plan.

So, we meet on a monthly basis.

As the instructional leader of the District,

I am a part of that team. So, the District

leadership team provides the support and

resources that the school sites need in order

to roll out their reading plans at the school

level.

The school leadership is key, and that starts with the principal at the school site. The leadership that we have in each one of our 250 school sites, there is a reading coach that sits on each one of our school leadership teams. So, the reading leadership team at those school sites is critical in addressing the specific needs for that school,

1 because, again, we are a very diverse

District. So, each school has different needsbased on their demographics.

4 Professional development is very,

5 very key in all of our plans. So, as I

6 painted the picture for you, it starts with

7 what the State provides for us and our

8 teachers have access to. But, certainly, as

9 part of our comprehensive reading plan and the

10 categorical dollars that come with it, the

lion's share of that is in very prescribed,

12 focused professional development. That starts

at the district level, but is certainly

14 funneled down all the way to the school level,

depending upon what their needs are.

So, schools have the ability to

17 | craft what they believe their professional

development plan should look like, based on

19 the needs of their students and the data that

20 is reflecting that.

21 And again, I start at the bottom

22 as student achievement, but that really should

be at the top because everything that we do is based on student learning. So, what our students need and how we can get them to achieve to their maximum, all students, is what helped drive our goals in our reading plan.

The other thing that is critical in our comprehensive reading plan, or, actually, in any plan that we are putting out there, I think a colleague this morning in the public speaking brought up the issue of ensuring that this initiative, this comprehensive look at literacy, allows the districts the flexibility to be able to align what we are already doing with whatever this plan is.

So, for us, currently, making sure that the comprehensive reading plan aligns with whatever the Title I reading plans may be, our school improvement plans not only in the Title I schools, but certainly in all of our schools a school improvement plan is

1 required.

Differentiated accountability that
the State requires for some of our schools
that are not performing or meeting AYP, as
aligned in their plans. So, making sure that
our comprehensive reading plan is in
conjunction with and not layered on top of
everything else that we are doing is critical
in our plans.

And then, the other piece that I think is important is the leverage of resources, our funds. And one of my colleagues said this morning, talked about that sustainability piece.

The comprehensive reading plan that we have access to through the State is a small piece of what our actual literacy plan is. To actually put dollars to that, our literacy comprehensive reading plan for the `10/11 school year is about \$25 million worth, and a fraction, relatively a sixth of that figure, is what we actually get with the

categorical dollars from the comprehensive reading plan.

So, I share that just to say that, when we sit down and write our plan, we are writing a plan to meet the needs of our diverse student population. We start with that. Then, my job, as the instructional leader, is to find the dollars, the resources to make that happen.

So, whether that be in programs or in personnel, in data systems, in technology, we write the plan, and then I find the resources to make that plan come to life. So, that involves breaking down some silos in many of our districts. Title I sits in another division than where I sit. Instructional technology sits in another place. Career and technical is another funding source, looking at Perkins dollars and supplemental academic instruction.

So, really being able to levy all the resources available to you to sustain

whatever plan it is that you put in place I think is critical.

I am going to share briefly our
Literacy Design Collaborative for Hillsborough
County. We are blessed to have been granted
a grant with the Gates Foundation centering
around literacy design. It basically is not
a program; it is a process; it is a framework
by which we look at how we can get kids to
critically think and critically and
argumentatively write, which so aligned with
what the Common Core Standards are going to
do.

So, we see the Literacy Design
Collaborative as an integral part in how we
are going to roll out our plans for literacy
across all content areas. That framework is
grounded, as I said, in critical reading,
analytical thinking, implementation of civil
discourse, a Socratic seminar piece, and
creation of writing products that are
specified as part of that Common Core

1 Standards.

of it.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2 Our components are included. 3 Think of a plug-and-play. So, it is a 4 template that allows you, that's the template 5 task that allows you to look at a prompt and 6 you plug in the content, whether that is 7 science, social science, ELA, and then 8 focusing your students on what they should do 9 and what those products should be as a result

There's a scoring rubric for the template task that describes and connects the demands and qualities established by those Common Core Standards, and the template module, which is a unit that provides an instructional ladder to organize instruction based on the instructional demands of the template task. So, that is just a piece of how we instructionally are carrying out and looking at how we are going to implement those Common Core Standards.

A couple of things that we would

like to see with the Striving Readers Grant, and I want to kind of really explain what eliminate the strict research means. have talked to my colleagues, as we have looked at the Striving Readers Grant before, some of the other components that were in it, it is that we want to ensure that there is flexibility, first of all, to those districts, but this research design, that it doesn't eliminate or exclude different groups of students. So, that whatever we are looking at doing, we are looking at all of our student populations and that we are not eliminating, kind of creating a has or has not type of a situation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

We want to focus on effective teaching rather than purchase analysis of specific reading programs. We want to look at more of a process by which we are improving reading instruction in our District or in our State, rather than a particular program that is going to meet that need, not looking at a

silver bullet, but a way to comprehensively look at the needs of our populations.

Focus on the job embedded and preventional development, follow-up support, and instructional delivery. We are hoping for it to support technology and materials conforming to the universal designs for learning principles -- we heard a lot in a lot of the presentations today about that instructional technology -- including an integrated assessment system. Assessments, again, have been a common theme throughout the day today.

Rigorous accountability measures and fidelity checks, those formative assessments that lead to that summative assessment are critical. I believe the professors this morning talked about that.

So, I want to again thank you for the opportunity to share our thoughts with you from a district's perspective. We are excited about the possibilities that this

comprehensive plan is going to bring and as it is going to connect with the literacy plans of not just the State of Florida and the District of Hillsborough County, but that many of our districts and the states are already working on.

So, thank you.

(Applause.)

DR. HARRIS: Okay. We want to thank our panelists for their presentations. So, great job.

We have just a few moments that we can have sort of a brief discussion between our guest panelists here and our experts.

So, at this time, I am going to ask, Dr. Jones, do you have a question you would like share?

MS. JONES: I also want to thank the panelists for sharing your experience and expertise. It has been tremendously helpful to us.

Deborah mentioned that one of the

unique aspects of Striving Readers is that we are looking at a birth-through-grade-12 age span. So, I just want to push us down a little to take a look at, from your perspective, looking at diverse learners, how do you see this vision of birth through, let's say, age 3?

Do you have in Florida and
Louisiana standards, early learning standards,
for birth to 3? What kind of assessments
would be appropriate? I just want to get us
thinking about what that looks like, what a
comprehensive literacy program looks like for
young children, especially young children who
are diverse learners.

DR. SLACK: Well, working with birth through 3 in Louisiana, and I'm pretty sure across the country, it is a new nuance for many state departments. We typically, or we have up to this point, primarily worked with preschool and through grade 12. So, the last six months especially, we have been

working very carefully and closely with those other agencies and entities that work with birth to 3, children in birth to 4; for example, the DSS, which is now the Department of Children and Family Services, DHH. And we are in the process of developing an integrated professional development system which includes assessment, which includes standards.

We don't have any formal standards yet with birth to 3. We do have draft standards for birth to 3. DCFS is primarily taking the lead on that, but we at the Department are very engaged in the development of that process, and tying it to our preschool standards, which, by the way, have been drafted and have been backmapped from the Common Core Standards, the K standards, the kindergarten standards.

So, we do have a draft out for public review now on our kindergarten standards. And our next step is to take the pre-K standards and backmap to the zero to 3.

But it has been interesting because these different agencies don't typically work very closely together to address the learning needs of zero to 3 in a comprehensive way. So, we have learned a lot by going through that process, in the past six months especially.

MS. TYE: I probably can't speak as specific as Dr. Slack just did because I am coming from a district perspective. So, I am going to have to rely on some colleagues that perhaps will speak during the public speaking.

But I do know that Florida does have voluntary pre-K for 4-year-olds. So, I certainly think that, as we look at those assessments, and we always do now, concentrate on students in our Head Start and our 3- and 4-year-olds.

But the birth to 3, probably the best place that we go, we have Early Steps because of the Part C to Part B students, in talking about our students with disabilities.

So, we have some structures in place that I believe would be a place for us to start and build upon, but I don't believe we have anything formal and standardized for those birth to 3.

So, I think, like many of us, that's why I love the colleague's comment this morning about having some flexibility perhaps by how we would use those funds, 15 percent being birth to 3, because I think many of us, that would be an area that we would want to focus on.

Because if I was to say where
there would be like a fatal flaw or a little
pain point, it would be, what do we have that
is structured for that birth-to-3 program?
So, in the State of Florida, that's where I
believe we are at, and my colleagues in
Florida can correct me if I'm not dead-on.

DR. PULLEN: And I can actually

DR. PULLEN: And I can actually comment on this just a little bit, not from a state's perspective, in terms of what we in

Virginia are doing as a State. But I am actually working on a project in the far southwest region of the State, in Virginia, which is a high poverty area. It is considered the coal field region.

And we are actually working across agencies in healthcare, education, and economic develop to create a replicable model of early language and literacy for children birth through age 3. So, we are actually going into the homes and providing in-home training to parents, working with parents to teach them how to increase the quality and quantity of language interaction in the home. And we are looking at how we can, then, link that later with preschool and go all the way through.

And one of the things that is interesting as I have been working on this project is that there are a lot of individual agencies and groups working in this area, but there is not an effort that brings everyone

know, they have this little region is getting this intervention, and this agency is working here. And I think there needs to be some effort in bringing everyone together so that we have the same goal in mind and pooling resources, instead of doing a little bit here, piecemeal here and there.

The good news is we have had some success in the pilot project that we have been working on with the families. We are excited about what we are doing with the individual families who are benefitting from this intervention at the moment.

DR. HARRIS: Okay. Deborah, do you have any questions?

MS. SPITZ: They have asked us to get up and speak into the microphone.

Because this program is birth to grade 12, and I asked this this morning, too, but we talk a lot about alignment and articulation across all the grade levels.

From each of your perspectives, I would like to hear a little bit more about, what are the key aspects of really aligning for birth to 12? You know, we can talk about that, but how do we that?

And then, particularly looking at those key, those difficult transition points, whether it is pre-K to K, three to four, middle to high school, how do we kind of smooth and align those difficult transition points?

DR. SLACK: Well, in Louisiana, to address this question, we have three pieces of our large comprehensive plan. We have a birth through pre-K plan, K to three, and fourtwelve.

So, over a year ago, we established task forces to help us with those different pieces of our plan, not knowing whether or not SRCL or this comprehensive effort would occur.

But, for the sake of improving our

current, what was our K-12 plan, we had a K-12 State plan in place, but it didn't address early learning, and our adolescent piece of that plan, it wasn't very strong.

So, we created these task forces with expertise that served on the task forces to help us inform the plan. So, when SRCL came out and we needed to established a State literacy team, what we did was we selected folks that served on each of these task forces to serve on our State Literacy Team that were familiar with the drafts that we have in place.

And from there, what we are doing is we are looking at the draft. We are looking at connecting the outputs of the birth-to-pre-K piece with the inputs of the K-three piece, and the outputs of the K-three piece with the inputs of the four-to-twelve piece. So, we are looking very carefully and closely at that transition and alignment across the entire plan.

MS. TYE: And from a District perspective, that is exactly what we do for now K-12. From the K-12 reading plan that is established in the District, it is done vertically. So, as we are writing the plan -- and I've got those folks, the frontline folks that are implementing it, the supervisors for those various levels -- that is exactly what we look at.

We look at what the output is, the primary, as we move into intermediate, and that becomes that input. So that there is a vertical articulation going up and it is seamless, and everyone is understanding what that looks like.

DR. PULLEN: And I think considering kids with disabilities and identifying kids with disabilities and responsiveness to intervention is another piece that I think we need to link across.

Much of the research in responsiveness to intervention has been

conducted at the elementary level, a little bit in the early childhood years, and a little bit in secondary years. But linking that together and making sure that we have clear connections with the interventions across the ages, and that individuals who are teachers, in-service teachers, who are meeting the needs of kids and adolescents actually have the knowledge and skills in reading.

You know, we move from a point where we are preparing to learn to read.

Then, we're learning to read. And then, we're reading to learn.

And once we hit upper elementary, middle school, and high school, much of the instruction in reading has shifted to reading to learn. We need to make sure that we have interventions across the grades and that we prepare teachers in the upper grades and secondary schools to meet the needs of kids who have disabilities or who are struggling to learn reading skills, even if they are lower

on that ladder. So, even if they have phonemic awareness and decoding skill issues, that we are still intervening at the right place with age-appropriate materials.

DR. HARRIS: Well, I would like to ask sort of a follow-up question, particularly around, given that this is a K-12 initiative, and we all know that we have high school students that are struggling with literacy skills, what strategies are we using or focusing on to make sure that we do include that group of 12th-graders that need it or 11-graders, the high school students that these kids should be at the stage where you described as reading to learn, but we all know so many of them are not?

So, how do we make sure we don't leave that group of kids out of this initiative?

DR. PULLEN: I think a lot of it goes back to professional development for high school teachers, teachers who are working. In

high school, we have teachers, excellent teachers, who were prepared in their content area and have had some education course work, but may not have had reading course work on actually how to teach reading. Yet, we have kids who get to that point or enter our districts who are at that level.

So, making sure that we provide opportunities for teachers at the high school level to actually learn how to teach reading to kids who may not have those foundational skills, I think that is a piece of it.

And again, linking back all the way across from having our plan start early and, if we think remediation versus intervention versus prevention, if we have a solid plan in place trying to prevent, and have fewer kids who actually get to that point that are in high school that are still at the decoding level.

I think I mentioned when I was going through what we should assess and

diagnose and teach. Once we get to, again, upper elementary, middle, and high school, many of the assessments and interventions are focused on fluency and comprehension. We need to make sure that those assessments are actually comprehensive, so that we intervene in the rights place for those kids.

MS. TYE: And I would only add that I think in the conversation this morning, that's another place for us to really look at supplementing how we are teaching it with some of the technology and other ways to engage that 12-grade non-reader. It has to look and feel and be very different for them to stay engaged in that process. So, that is where we tend to really look at some of those supplemental programs that are more technology-based that can assist us with that.

DR. SLACK: I'm going to address that question in a couple of ways. To build on what Dr. Pullen said, starting early with prevention. In Louisiana, we tested an

approach, a K-12 approach. We found that having different programs out there, different levels, we have not had as much success as when we had continuity and consistency across the grade levels.

So, we have a pilot program in place in our State that is called the K-12 Pilot Program. So, what this involves is a feeder system where a collection of schools, an elementary school, a middle school, and a high school, apply for some State funding to implement the components of our plan and best practices in literacy.

What we found is not just at their one particular level do they collaborate and coordinate, they collaborate with other levels of the system. We have seen great success by doing that.

So, I would encourage, if at all possible, a feeder system where units apply together. We are now conceptualizing that in our zero-to-pre-K plan, having those sites

collaborate and coordinate more with early childcare centers and Early Head Start and Heat Start in their districts. So, a feeder system in which you can promote continuity and consistency in the concept and ideas across all grade levels has been very, very important.

And also, just to zero-in on that intervention factor at the high school level, we do double-dosing for these students. In addition to extended time for literacy across the curriculum and across the school day, double-dosing for these students where they get electives, Carnegie credits as well, so that they don't lose any credits.

DR. HARRIS: Okay. Let me ask my guest panelists, do you have any additional questions?

MS. JONES: Sure. Never give up an opportunity to ask a question.

(Laughter.)

You know, Dr. Pullen, you talked

about the workforce in general. I want to sort of think about this in this broad context, again, of birth to grade 12 and think about the capacity that states will have to really provide the kind of teacher preparation and ongoing professional development for a workforce that really could increase the literacy skills of children birth to grade 12.

So, I guess I'm asking, what is your thinking around what we need and maybe at your state level as far as making sure that we have the workforce that can really do the job for this initiative?

DR. SLACK: Well, we connect very closely with our institutions of higher education and our teacher preparation programs as well.

What we did a few years back is we developed some reading competencies in which we reviewed each of the teacher preparation programs in our State, not just the colleges, but all teacher preparation programs, and how

well they prepared students to be teachers of literacy, for example, and not just teachers of literacy, but classroom teachers.

And what we found is that those programs needed some intervention and creating quality course work to help teachers become better prepared for teaching literacy.

It wasn't an easy process at first. Of course, you know, working with colleges and universities, the State coming in and sharing with them what we thought needed to happen was not an easy thing. But it has transitioned or segued into a much better relationship.

And right now, what we do have in place are much stronger teacher preparation programs as a result of this process. We do today still coordinate and collaborate very carefully and closely with our Board of Regents. We have college professors that work very closely with us on our plan, and the deans of education meet monthly, and we inform

them of where we are in our literacy efforts on a regular, ongoing basis.

We feed information into them, and we take their insights and use their information to help feed into ours. But we are very closely connected in Louisiana.

DR. PULLEN: I can talk a little bit about what we are doing at the University of Virginia in terms of our teacher preparation that I think helps with this K-12, at least in the area of special education, and actually it overlaps.

All of our special education

programs at UVA are now dual endorsement

programs. So, when students come into special

education, they are dually-endorsed and they

take a track. So, they are certified K

through 12 special education, but they pick a

track, either elementary or secondary. So

that when they leave, they actually have

endorsement in both general ed and special ed.

So, for example, the students who

will be secondary teachers, so if they are a biology major at the college, then they would enter the secondary track in the special education program, and they would be prepared. So, they get the same reading courses that a student who is teaching elementary school would get. So, they actually are highly-qualified. They leave with the ability to become highly-qualified in science education and have special education.

So that, our goal is that, when our teachers leave, when our students graduate, that they are actually endorsed with general ed and special ed, and they have the tools necessary to meet the needs of kids in their classroom, regardless of whether they have or do not have a disability.

I think the fact that our secondary teachers are actually getting elementary reading is a benefit to those students who are going to end up teaching our secondary students, and actually in the course

work reading development, reading diagnosis, reading remediation, and actually tutor elementary students in reading. Then, they are going to be going in and teaching high school biology.

MS. TYE: And I would like to give all of them my card to recruit them to Florida.

(Laughter.)

Because it sounds like that is a wonderful opportunity.

And I will talk about what happens when they come to us. Part of the Empowering Effective Teachers Project that Hillsborough County has been working on, it looks very similar to a lot of the Race to the Top initiative.

We have a two-year induction program that right now this is the first class that is now getting reading endorsement, which is what our State offers as part of their induction program.

So, our hope, our goal is -- we 1 2 have approximately 640 new teachers this year, 3 and that is an average that we have about 4 every year -- is to start to get that 5 workforce, those new teachers coming in, very sound in literacy and provide that training 6 7 for the reading endorsement, so that they 8 become better literacy teachers regardless of 9 their content expertise. So, that is just something that 10 11 Hillsborough County is beginning this school 12 year with our new inductees, our new class, so 13 to speak, of teachers. 14 DR. HARRIS: Well, it would be 15 nice if we had more time to stay in this 16 conversation, but we do need to transition. 17 So, let's give our panelists another hand. 18 19 (Applause.) 20 Thank you. 21 So, at this time, we are going to 22 take a five-minute transition. Then, we are

going to come back for our public comment

period. So, we will start five minutes from

now.

So, if you plan to speak for the record, make sure that you have registered out front, so that when we come back, we will start with our speakers that are signed up and we will do it in the order that they have signed up.

So, five minutes.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 2:42 p.m. and went back on the record at 2:49 p.m.)

MS. NEWSOME-JOHNSON: We are going to open it up for our public speakers now. We will have our first speaker.

MR. KRATZ: Thank you.

My name is Jeff Kratz. I'm with the American Library Association.

ALA is the world's oldest and largest library association. It represents over 63,000 libraries of all types.

The Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy Program was established to advance literacy skills for birth to grade 12. This is a longstanding goal of libraries, of the over 96,000 at public schools.

To help ensure the success of the SRCL discretionary grant program, the American Library Association encourages the Department to include benefits utilizing and partnering with public school libraries.

Research shows that children get ready to read years before they start school. In countless communities across the country, a public library is a place where children's literacy education begins. While today's libraries help to ensure that students graduate with a 21st century education, they are also the building place for fundamental reading skills and to develop a love of reading.

Public libraries open their doors to new parents with story hours and other

programs to guide a child's literacy development. Public libraries can also help with parents in addressing specialized needs for children as well as accommodating parents who speak English as a second language.

Likewise, school libraries play a fundamental role in students' literacy development as well. While the responsibility for the successful implementation of reading promotion and instruction is shared by the entire school community, library programs serve as the hub of literacy learning in the school.

A recent survey found that 83
percent of students often get their individual
independent reading materials from their own
school library. School librarians can
individualize reading curriculum to develop
reading skills for a lifelong love of reading.

ALA strongly recommends that the Department include the benefits of utilizing and partnering with public and school

libraries as part of SRCL's discretionary grant application. We have found over and over that various applications for federal funds rarely take advantage of our services and programs unless efforts are made perfectly clear and applications and use of funds are statutory definitions.

Accordingly, to help SRCL discretionary grantees realize their goals, their forthcoming state comprehensive literacy plans, ALA asks that the Department of Education include as part of its notice inviting application provisions that ensure that public libraries are explicitly described as public, nonprofit organizations/agencies with a proven track record of effectiveness in improving early literacy development from birth all the way to kindergarten.

Also, ALA would like the

Department of Education to recognize that

local education agencies are encouraged to

develop applications in conjunction with

school library programs.

Thank you.

MS. COOPER: I'm Ginny Cooper. I serve as the Chief Librarian for the District of Columbia, and I also am here in my capacity as the State Librarian for the District of Columbia.

I come to make two points. First, public libraries everywhere are doing exactly the work you want to be done. Children's librarians are trained childhood educators, early childhood and school-age children as well. We work with children at home, at daycare centers, in community centers, and, of course in libraries. You have the opportunity to support this work and strengthen the coordination among schools and other agencies.

Second, requiring that state
libraries serve as participants in the grant
planning process -- it happens in a number of
states already, but it is not a requirement
and often doesn't happen -- would extend the

1 reach of this important work even further.

First, some examples of good work done in libraries:

In the District, infant and toddler storytimes as well as other preschool programs are held at least weekly in all 24 libraries in the District. Attendance ranges from 10 or fewer to 90 or more. Now 90 is too many, of course, and I'll tell you what we do at the Watha T. Daniel-Shaw Library, which opened in early August.

This beautiful library serves a community with lots of children and babies, and it is very near a Metro station. So, now one day a week, three or four storytimes are done so everybody can be accommodated.

Fifteen minutes after the first one starts, the second one goes, and then in another location a third one will begin 15 minutes later.

And we continue, so parents have the opportunity to show up without

preregistering, that children have a chance to be a part of this experience, and that our staff are ready to do plenty of programs to meet that important need.

So, this means that everybody is served in a way that makes sense. And while it is what we do in one library, there are great examples at every other library in the country, actually.

In Brooklyn, about seven years ago, we did a program called Brooklyn Reads to Babies. And I am showing you some of that, the great graphics that were a part of that.

These flyers were distributed at libraries, but, more important, printed in seven languages. They were distributed at churches, at other places of worship, laundromats, medical waiting rooms, and more, bus shelters, street banners, and at Grand Army Plaza an 8-foot-high, 35-foot-long wall had these great images and the strong message "Read to your baby."

This flyer, as I said, available in seven languages, also identifies some great books to read, some behaviors to use when you're reading, and, importantly, some of the kinds of things to expect from babies and young children.

The fact that they don't sit on your lap and listen doesn't mean they are not learning, for example, things like that, that are important as part of that parent education.

Libraries not only help children read, they help children love to read. Here's the story of one who loves books. At the Martin Luther King Library just a short distance from here, there is a family, one of many, that visits the children's room every Saturday. Brother and sister go to the storytime. Mom reads to the baby. Dad helps everyone choose books to take home.

Last Saturday -- I heard this from the staff on Monday -- a nine-month-old baby

took his very first steps, and he took them towards the board books that he had come to love.

In addition, and you have heard this from my colleague as well, excellent work by the American Library Association, and especially the division that supports service to young children and to public libraries, have worked together to create and promote the importance of reading to little ones, ways to do it effectively, and studies that show why it matters to do so. You will likely hear more about that from others this afternoon.

And my second point, state

libraries. State libraries are available in

every state and territory. Through state

libraries, you literally reach every library

in the nation with information and the

opportunities to be a part of this important

work. I urge you to require that

participation by state libraries in this

process.

Striving Readers Comprehensive 1 2 Literacy Program was established to advance 3 literacy skills from birth through grade 12, and that is what libraries do. 4 It is, we say 5 at the District of Columbia, our first and 6 most important work. 7 You have the opportunity to make 8 sure it happens, not just because of good 9 intentions, but on purpose. 10 Thank you for this opportunity. MS. Gratale: Good afternoon. 11 12 My name is Daniella Gratale, and I'm Manager of Advocacy of Nemours, which is 13 14 a premiere children's health system. We thank you for the opportunity 15 16 to provide input on this program. Our goal at Nemours is to help children grow up healthy. 17 18 This commitment extends beyond our work in the 19 healthcare system. We have also been 20 committed to helping children become 21 successful readers, and that means starting 22 early.

As my colleague mentioned this morning, Nemours BrightStart! was established in 2005 to address dyslexia. It is a program that is targeted to pre-kindergartners and

5 kindergartners.

The program has three key components. The first is screening for all children in their pre-K year. The second is small group, intensive instruction to children identified as at-risk of reading failure. And finally, there's rescreening after the intervention is complete.

Two-thirds of participating atrisk children move to age-appropriate range in
their reading readiness skills after receiving
the Nemours BrightStart! intervention. Our
experiences with this Nemours BrightStart!
program have informed my comments. So, my
comments will focus specifically on the prekindergarten and kindergarten age range. And
specifically, I'll talk about the SEA and LEA
capacity and support as well as meeting the

1 needs of diverse learners.

So, first, for SEA and LEA capacity and support, as states are developing their literacy and determining what they will require of their subgrantees, we urge you to consider the following core components:

No. 1, age-appropriate goals and strategies. Targeted goals and strategies for various age groups, including preschool age children, should be implemented in the state plans.

No. 2, program selection. States should provide subgrantees with guidance and actually criteria on how to select an effective and an evidence-informed program.

No. 3, training. Training of teachers or of childcare providers will be critical to the overall success of these grants, and it should be closely linked with selected curricula and teaching strategies.

Finally, evaluation. Grantees will need to evaluate the success of their

programs in the short-term and, ultimately, in the long-term. States should provide them with information on effective evaluation techniques.

Additionally, states should make certain requirements of their subgrants.

These include:

No, 1, evidence. Subgrantees should have to demonstrate that the literacy program that they are investing in has some evidence of effectiveness and, when possible, this should include longitudinal results.

No. 2 is training. Subgrantees should provide training to their actual teachers and childcare providers who are going to implement the curriculum, and they should demonstrate a system to monitor implementation fidelity.

When possible, they should also consider implementing a train-the-trainer model to promote sustainability.

Next is screening. Subgrantees

should select a literacy screening tool that can be utilized to identify pre-reading skills or reading proficiency. All young children should be screened.

Next is small group instruction.

Subgrantees should provide small group,

intensive instruction to all children who are
identified at risk.

Subgrantees should rescreen children after the program has been implemented to evaluate its effectiveness and, also, to determine if additional support or intervention is needed.

And finally, rescreening.

Now I would like to move on to meeting the needs of diverse learners. And many of the themes for this section are also very consistent with what I have already said.

No. 1 criteria that we would definitely think makes sense for meeting the needs of diverse at-risk students is training.

Programs should incorporate targeted professional development relating to the

characteristics and needs of diverse at-risk learners. We found that sometimes teachers make erroneous assumptions about the needs of diverse learners. And that can include, basically, thinking that they are unable to learn in the mainstream setting or in some cases that they can't actually teach them.

So, basically, Nemours

BrightStart! has shown us that, when needs are specifically addressed through training, teachers can change their belief systems.

Next is universal child screening with parent permission. As I have previously addressed, that is critical.

Small group instruction is also critical to meeting the needs of diverse learners.

And finally, it is very important that we meet the needs of parents as well.

So, the subgrantees should really be focusing on what their parental engagement strategies are.

Nemours thanks you for the

opportunity to provide this input, and we look

forward to engaging with you in the future.

MS. LARSON: My name is Mindy

Larson. I work for the Institute for

Larson. I work for the Institute for
Educational Leadership, which is a national
nonprofit organization dedicated to building
the capacity of individuals and organizations
in education and related fields to work
together across policies, programs, and
sectors.

We submit these observations and recommendations regarding the Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy Grant Program as it relates to meeting the needs of diverse learners.

IEL houses the National
Collaborative on Workforce and Disability for
Youth, which is funded by the U.S. Department
of Labor's Office of Disability Employment
Policy.

We specifically focus on the range

of issues and opportunities that young people need to successfully transition to adulthood, and we focus on the needs of all youth, with a special emphasis on youth with disabilities.

These recommendations reflect our professional experiences working with local, state, and national-level government organizations, community-based youth-serving organizations, and other nationally-focused organizations such as the Campaign for Youth, the National Youth Employment Coalition, the Collaboration to Promote Self-Determination, and the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities.

Improving the literacy skills and academic achievement of all young people is of great concern to the youth service professionals who work with struggling leaders daily in and across multiple settings and service systems at the local, state, and national level.

Low literacy is a boundary-

crossing problem. Therefore, it necessitates a boundary-crossing strategy. As state and local education agencies and subgrantees plan and implement strategies to improve literacy instruction across the age span, we recommend that they develop strong collaborative partnerships and linkages with the various public agencies, community-based organizations, and post-secondary institutions that currently serve children and youth who are struggling readers.

The problem of low literacy skills amongst struggling readers is encountered daily by the professionals who work with these youth in the after-school and out-of-school hours in multiple settings, including foster care and independent living programs, juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs, youth workforce, development, and career preparation programs, college-readiness programs, parks and recreation programs, and leadership and community service programs,

1 just to name a few.

State literacy plans should take into consideration the role that these other youth service agencies and organizations can and do play in supporting literacy development among adolescents.

The engagement of other public systems and community organizations is especially critical to reaching those youth who have already disengaged or dropped out of the public school system.

To effectively motivate and accelerate literacy among adolescents, states and their subgrantees need to embed literacy instruction in not just the academic courses within a school system, but also in the activities that youth participate in, both in school and out of school, that teenagers find most compelling and relevant to their interests.

For most teens, career exploration, job training, and work

experiences are primary interests. Other activities they gravitate towards are sports and recreation, leadership opportunities, community service, arts and media projects, and business and entrepreneurship activities.

While these activities are sometimes offered during the school day or as a part of classes, many teens engage in these activities outside of school through community-based organizations and other publicly-funded programs during after-school hours, on the weekends, and during the summer.

For this reason, states and subgrantees should provide professional training or extend the professional training in effective literacy instruction strategies that they will be offering to educators, also to the youth service professionals who work both within and outside the school system to provide career exploration, job training, work experiences, and other highly-engaging activities that teenagers find relevant.

Many of the programs that work
with youth outside of the school day aim to
improve academic skills of the youth that are
participating in their programs. However,
their staff and volunteers often lack the
professional skills and knowledge of the most
effective evidence-based literacy instruction

strategies.

With proper training, the youth service professionals and volunteers who frequently interact with, mentor, and train youth in these non-academic programs and settings could incorporate literacy development activities to help low-literacy students improve their reading and writing.

IEL currently works with two
evidence-based youth programs. One is the
Ready to Achieve Mentoring Program, and
another called the High School High-Tech
Program, to engage youth with disabilities in
out-of-school time as well as after school and
sometimes during the school day.

And we know from experience that these young people need literacy development and that the staff who work with them could benefit from training that will be provided to educators within the school systems. So, we hope that the states and the LEAs and the SEA agencies will partner with these other programs that are reaching adolescents to make sure that those most at risk can be provided the most effective literacy instruction in multiple settings.

Thank you.

MS. GETTMAN: Good afternoon.

I'm Lucy Gettman, Director of Federal Programs for the National School Boards Association.

The National School Boards

Association, representing over 95,000 local school board members across the nation through our state school boards associations, is pleased to submit this statement regarding SEA and LEA capacity and support in the Striving

Readers Comprehensive Literacy Program.

by school board members selected by and from the communities they serve, are well-positioned to help implement the new program.

Many school districts provide early learning experiences for preschool children or collaborate closely with early childhood providers and, therefore, bridge much of the birth-to-grade-12 continuum in the Striving Readers Program.

NSBA applauds the Department's efforts so far to disseminate \$10 million in funds to states to establish or support state literacy leadership teams. Broad knowledge and experience from diverse perspectives on these teams is vital to developing comprehensive literacy plans to meet the needs of all learners.

The next crucial step is to assure that the remaining \$190 million in fiscal year 2010 funding is disseminated in a timely

manner to provide instruction, professional development, assessments, and other critical components of the comprehensive literacy plan.

State and local capacity and support are essential to closing achievement gaps and raising student achievement.

Therefore, NSBA's responses to the three questions on SEA and LEA capacity and support are as follows:

Question 1: perhaps the most significant opportunity for state literacy plans is to bridge the child development and education continuum from birth to grade 12. The historical independence of early learning in K-12 systems is reflected in the structure of funding and oversight that at times undermines coordination, alignment, and effectiveness.

The Striving Readers Program is a unique opportunity to build a bridge along the entire continuum in the area of literacy. To maximize the impact of the program, it is

imperative that states recognize all these elements in their plans.

One strategy to do so is to optimize the expertise and opportunities already available in each state. For example, most states have or are establishing early childhood advisory councils authorized in the Head Start reauthorization to recommend improvements for the quality, availability, and coordination of services for children from birth to school entry. There are, undoubtedly, many other examples of expertise and capacity, including those just described in other public commentary.

Collaboration where appropriate and possible on quality standards, professional development assessments, and other shared interests can increase the impact of all and extend the reach and benefits to all children.

Question 2: the Striving Readers program can most effectively help SEAs and

LEAs transition to Common Core State Standards by preserving the state and local role that led to voluntary development and adoption of the standards by most states.

The standards provide a framework for assuring that all students are college and career ready, but ultimately it will be up to states and school districts to implement them. Further, implementation of Striving Readers must recognize that LEAs are subject to other federal statutory accountability requirements, such as those in the No Child Left Behind Act, during the transition to Common Core

Standards. Therefore, Striving Readers should maximize flexibility for school districts to determine local needs and implement effective strategies to address them.

Question 3: SEAs can play a significant role in leveraging the use of federal funds and resources under Striving Readers by deploying state setaside funds for technical assistance, professional

development, disseminating research, et cetera, on comprehensive literacy. States may also choose to review their state plans for ESEA and other federal funds for additional opportunities for coordination. However, it is imperative that LEAs retain flexibility and authority to determine how to use federal funds in the most effective way.

In conclusion, local leadership
from LEAs and early childhood is crucial to
the success of the Striving Readers Program.
Other federal programs such as Promise
Neighborhoods fully recognize that communitybased solutions are the key to success. The
Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy
Program is a welcome opportunity that could
become a model for P-12 collaboration in other
areas.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this statement. NSBA looks forward to an ongoing dialog. Please call on us to assist in this vital work.

MS. MEADOWS: Good afternoon.

My name is Laura Meadows, and I'm the Executive Director of Captions for Literacy, a charitable trust. With me is our Director, Jack Taggart.

We are most grateful to the

Department of Education for establishing its

Striving Leaders Comprehensive Literacy State

Grant Program and for giving organizations

such as ours a chance to comment on the design

of such a grant program.

The mission of Captions for

Literacy is to bring to the attention of the

general public the overlooked value of using

television captions to improve reading

ability. Opening the free television captions

provides a powerful opportunity for those

watching to connect the sound of the spoken

word with the sight of the printed word in the

context of the action unfolding on the screen

to explain or reinforce the meaning and

comprehension. Television becomes a free

reading practice resource.

There are two aspects of this grant program that need to be considered in drafting the program. First, we do not ask that all grant applications include rigorous scientific research as part of the program.

In the case of TV captions, for example, over 25 years of research has been done showing their value for learning to read. What is needed now is dissemination of the results of this research to a general public.

To have family participation for those under school age, we need a public service announcement to spread the word to the public at large about the value of TV captions. Finland and India and a number of other countries use captions as a part of their educational effort very successfully.

Second, we urge that the Doing
What Works website of the Department of
Education mention the value of television
captions and the ability for organizations

such as ours to use this grant to encourage states to build the use of television captions into the state literacy programs.

Studies also show that, on average, children watch television many hours a day. Five to seven are some of the higher numbers, thousands of hours every year, often more hours than they spend in classrooms.

With television present in 98 percent of American homes, that means that the use of television captions to help learning to read is very easily scalable.

It's tragic to waste this
opportunity to use this priceless free
television captions when the National
Assessment of Educational Progress reports
that over 50 percent of Blacks and Hispanics
fail to learn to read at the basic level by
the fourth grade.

There have been some objections to children watching too much TV, usually without considering the content. Fortunately, most

recently, in 2006, a pediatrician, Dimitri
Christakis, and Professor Fred Zimmerman have
analyzed both the content and the context in
which television is watched. They cite with
approval programs such as Between the Lions
which does use captions, not for everything,
but occasionally.

They say in their book,

"Television viewing can be beneficial. It can
be entertaining, broadening, and educational.

It just has to be used properly, generally

speaking, with age-appropriate programs."

The Department of Education

itself, of course, does give many grants to

PBS, WGBH, WETA for television programs. I'm

not quite sure how they don't require research

for those, but the research certainly is

something that they have done very much on

their own.

The years of the research that have been done on TV captions is summarized on our website, www.captionsforliteracy.org. I

have some cards and other materials for you, in addition.

Thank you so very much.

MS. SCHILLER: Good afternoon.

I'm Ellen Schiller, and I'm with SRI International, a policy research firm located in Menlo Park, California. We also have offices here in Arlington, Virginia.

I, too, want to thank the

Department for allowing us to speak today and provide public comment.

Currently, SRI is conducting one of the evaluations of a Striving Readers grant, and we are also conducting, in collaboration with MDRC, the IES evaluation of the impact of RtI on reading outcomes of young readers.

We are also in partnership with a number of organizations where we provide technical assistance to states on helping them design, collect, and analyze formative and summative systems for knowing whether or not

programs for young children work. It is in that context that I provide our comments for today.

First, we would like to encourage the Department to elevate the importance of the evaluation in the forthcoming announcement. By doing so, the Department will be able to speak to what worked and how.

While we recognize that an evaluation is only the beginning, we also would like to encourage the Department to take a look and take the leadership, as other federal programs have done, in elevating the standards of the research or evaluation that is conducted by the states to be able to ultimately answer the questions of what worked and how.

A number of years ago, I was a special assistant in research in the Office of Special Education programs at the Department.

So, I feel your pain because there is statutory language that requires, and rightly

so, that 95 percent of the dollars go for direct services to the children and 5 percent of the monies go to the states for administrative purposes, of which evaluation could come under those 5 percent dollars, in addition to the dollars that are allocated to the Department for the National Assessment.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So, we would just like to encourage you to look at those dollars that would be available for evaluations carefully, encourage partnerships among different organizations because the challenges for answering the question, what works and how, in a project of this magnitude at the state level are quite complex, and multiple expertise needs to be at the table to help solve those questions because, ultimately, you are going to need to respond to Congress and to the public what worked and how after \$178 million was invested in a birth-to-12 state literacy program.

So, thank you.

1 MS. FREENY: My name is Micki

2 Freeny. I am the Coordinator of Youth

3 Services for the District of Columbia Public

4 Library.

Because you have heard from other speakers from the library community, I will speak to you very briefly about the importance of including public libraries on literacy teams.

This has always been important because of the supportive role that libraries play in K-to-12 education. But, as your efforts expand to include the birth-to-5 population, the participation of public libraries is even more important.

For decades and decades, and actually for more than a half a century now, preschool storytime, when no one else was providing this service, and which helped promote school readiness and early literacy skills, has been a staple of public library services.

For many, many years, I and my

colleagues in public libraries before brain

3 research showed us to be right observed the

4 positive effect that reading aloud and sharing

5 books in a fun and positive way had on the

6 development of children, especially on their

7 acquisition of early literacy skills, the

8 skills they need before they can learn to

often give direct instruction.

9 read.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Public libraries have not only consistently provided age-appropriate materials for parents to share with their children at home -- free, I might add -- but we also model positive behavior through our storytimes to the parents and caregivers, and

Many public libraries have programs which teach parents about the six early literacy skills and how to promote these through singing, talking, and reading to their children at home and in daycare locations.

We know that children who have

positive experiences with books and reading from infancy are more motivated to learn to read, and a motivated learner is a better learner.

Public libraries are a very important player in the realm of early childhood development and education. Please consider them as important partners in statewide literacy efforts.

MS. SPITZ: Well, with that, I am going to conclude our program today. Thank you very much.

Well, first, I would like to thank again our panelists. Thank you so much for being here. And the Department officials that helped out today.

(Applause.)

And we do very much appreciate the public comments that we received today, and certainly will take them into consideration.

If anyone did bring written statements to submit, they should submit those

		Page	268
1	at the registration desk.		
2	And we did record today's session.		
3	So, that will be posted on our website when it		
4	is available, I think probably a few days into		
5	next week, and also all the materials from		
6	today's session.		
7	I also want to thank the folks who		
8	attended we really appreciate that and		
9	also the people on our webcast.		
10	So, thank you very much and have a		
11	good evening and weekend.		
12	(Applause.)		
13	(Whereupon, at 3:26 p.m., the		
14	proceedings in the above-entitled matter were		
15	adjourned.)		
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			

22

	233:4	251:14	24:12 42:13	advocate 31:17
A 124.14	accommodations	actual 12:19	139:17,19,21	174:12
abandoned 34:14	174:16 189:21	203:17 243:14	145:21 151:11	advocating 32:22
abilities 160:21	accompanied 62:17	adapt 95:21 120:8	Administration's	affect 100:16
ability 46:15 69:22	account 50:1,11	adaptations 95:12	139:13	155:10 160:15
70:13 71:14,15	100:19 121:12	Adapting 188:12	administrative	<b>Affiliate</b> 113:12
73:1 131:9 195:16	133:2,21 134:16	adaptive 94:11,16	16:18 61:3 264:4	afraid 35:13
197:18 201:16	175:8 189:15	95:4	administrator	<b>afternoon</b> 5:2 22:9
228:8 258:16	accountability 90:4	add 50:14 57:22	139:3 152:9	124:9 135:17,22
259:22	109:12 203:2	93:14 128:1 130:9	administrators	137:3,5 138:8
able 11:20 12:3	208:14 256:11	165:13 192:16	10:9 28:7 60:21	140:3,4,8 141:11
34:5 45:5 46:6	accountable 110:21	222:8 266:13	86:14 104:22	141:14 147:15
47:12 72:4 91:5	117:14 118:7,9	added 34:13	105:2,13 106:2	154:6 175:2 192:4
106:20 110:12,16	123:6 134:22	adding 78:16	117:18 133:17	239:13 240:11
128:3 155:1	accurate 178:7	addition 43:14	adolescent 37:21	252:13 258:1
156:18,19,21	accurately 73:2	63:11 119:18	37:22 42:14,21	262:4
157:8,17 159:7	achieve 171:3	153:19 224:11	43:16,20 48:1	after-school 80:6,8
161:11 185:9	202:4 251:18	239:4 262:2 264:6	49:10 60:1 79:17	86:6 191:1,2
198:20 202:14	achievement 12:12	additional 36:18	92:22 151:16	248:15 250:11
204:21 263:8,15	20:2 24:11 126:17	50:14 103:3 111:8	217:3	after-thought
above-entitled	129:2,5 141:18	173:3,8 224:17	adolescents 49:11	122:19
268:14	148:15 179:6	244:13 257:4	219:8 249:6,13	age 16:20 69:17
<b>absence</b> 75:20	183:17 185:10	Additionally 243:5	252:8	70:19 108:12,16
absolutely 83:13	196:11 201:22	address 36:14	adopt 59:18 63:22	109:10 143:5,11
88:7	247:16 254:5,6	44:16 61:7,8 67:1	188:15	156:4 157:7
abstract 81:18	achieving 112:13	80:19 108:11	adopted 59:17	163:20 178:20
84:17	131:14	111:7 136:17	adopting 59:11	210:2,7 214:10
academic 10:6	acknowledge 32:20	144:13 190:5	adopting 35.11 adoption 256:3	241:20 242:9,9
73:21 81:12,18	acknowledged	212:4 216:13	adoptions 62:15	248:5 259:13
83:10 84:4,10,13	69:10	217:2 222:19	adulthood 247:2	agencies 15:14
89:3 132:16	Acknowledging	241:3 256:17	adults 76:16 79:3	152:5 211:2 212:2
204:19 247:16	114:18	addressed 26:7	85:9	214:7,21 234:21
249:15 251:3	acquisition 125:20	27:4 28:6 29:20	advance 232:2	235:17 248:3,8
<b>Academy</b> 24:1	266:7	44:20 61:19	240:2	249:4 252:7
139:15	Act 14:11 256:12	176:22 179:14	advanced 46:14	agency 215:3
accelerate 249:13	action 163:8 190:8	245:10,14	Advancement 2:14	agenda 18:19 138:1
Accelerated 152:13	258:20	addresses 179:7	4:7 22:5 64:15	147:14
access 55:18,19	actionable 190:4	188:6 189:17	<b>Advancing</b> 43:16	agent 58:4
110:18 149:20	actions 89:16	addressing 30:6	advantage 125:7	ages 121:4 219:6
195:10,22 196:7	180:16 190:12	155:21 175:8	234:4	age-appropriate
197:8 198:2 201:8	activate 158:20	188:11 200:22	advisor 2:8 9:13	111:11 220:4
203:16	activation 159:1	233:3	42:20 154:1	241:14 242:7
accessible 56:5	active 74:10	add-on 37:14	advisory 33:15,16	261:12 266:11
accommodate	activities 16:17	adjourned 268:15	42:15 43:15,17	ago 26:19 47:14,14
193:13	38:17 132:18	administer 74:8	255:7	57:8 179:9 216:17
accommodated	145:21 249:17	110:12,14,14	advocacy 119:3	237:11 263:18
236:16	250:2,5,6,9,22	administration	240:13	agree 108:19
accommodating	230.2,3,0,3,22	aummsu auvn	2 <del>4</del> 0.13	agree 100.17
				<u> </u>

agreements 117:20	analysis 51:3	223:11,20	<b>Army</b> 237:20	94:8 96:16 97:2,3
ahead 101:22	183:13 196:14	applying 18:2	articulating 182:9	194:6,6 195:17
aim 97:13 98:8	207:17	74:18 164:17	articulation 26:9	208:11,16 210:10
189:4 251:2	analytic 46:7	appointed 153:7	26:13 29:21 103:4	212:16 222:3,5
aimed 151:15	analytical 205:19	appointed 155.7	215:22 218:13	254:2 255:17
<b>ALA</b> 231:20 233:20	analyze 186:20	138:14 153:11	arts 23:15 39:10	assets 112:9,20
234:11,19	262:21	appraisal 184:16	85:6 120:9 139:19	· ·
algorithms 95:19	analyzed 261:3	appraisal 184.10 appreciate 89:11	250:4	assignments 117:22
align 188:13	anchored 84:16,17	101:6 267:18	aside 143:20	assist 181:8 190:13
202:14 216:10	anchoring 81:17	268:8	asked 20:16 26:22	222:18 257:22
	ancillary 30:2		60:20 149:4 154:8	assistance 2:4 5:10
<b>aligned</b> 61:12 99:19 182:13	and/or 76:11	<b>approach</b> 25:10 34:11 82:15 83:6		5:22 16:19 138:11
			191:19 215:17,20	
203:5 205:11	announcement	84:19 184:20	asking 12:18	183:5,12,15
aligning 216:3	259:14 263:7	223:1,1	191:20 225:9	256:22 262:20 assistant 2:4,6,9,19
alignment 3:15	Annual 153:16	<b>approaches</b> 176:12 189:18 190:20	asks 234:11	, , ,
49:21 63:21 99:16	answer 124:16		aspects 33:18	3:8,19 5:9,22 6:9
99:20,22 100:5	263:16	appropriate 40:18	194:17 210:1	9:5 22:13 138:10
110:22 215:21	answering 264:13	49:21 50:5 62:17	216:3 259:2	138:18 152:14,16
217:21 254:17	anticipate 141:8	64:7 110:6 116:9	assess 33:9 116:5	153:6,11 263:19
aligns 85:3 202:18	anymore 34:12	169:1 174:15	165:6,12,18	assistive 190:18
alive 107:17	173:15	210:11 255:15	168:15,17 169:7,8	assists 194:16
Alliance 42:15	anyway 36:15	appropriately-di	169:12 170:15	Associate 2:13,15
allocated 31:21	133:19	39:22	171:21 221:22	4:6 6:4 22:4
264:6	apart 170:11,13	Appropriations	assessing 87:21	64:14 65:1 150:4
allow 17:15 62:18	applauds 253:12	14:11	164:15	<b>association</b> 6:14,22
162:8	<b>Applause</b> 42:3 64:9	approval 261:5	assessment 3:15	10:9,20 23:10
allowing 262:10	89:7 175:1 192:3	approximately	16:4 30:9,11,13	32:4 139:8 231:19
allows 144:9 178:8	209:8 230:19	199:14 230:2	30:17 35:1 38:21	231:21 232:8
195:7 197:7	267:17 268:12	area 36:21 103:19	39:1 43:12 47:5	239:6 252:16,18
198:10 202:13	applicants 121:6	103:22 104:1	81:8 86:18 87:7	associations 252:20
206:4,5	123:6	106:11 108:18	88:16 90:13 94:12	assumption 133:6
alongside 119:17	application 68:19	130:4 136:9	96:10,21 97:8	133:18
aloud 266:4	102:14 103:2	171:21 177:16	107:2 110:6,7,12	assumptions 134:2
alter 163:8	104:18 125:14	213:11 214:4,21	110:16 113:17	245:3
amazing 121:17	144:22 145:1	221:3 227:11	134:20 145:13	assure 253:20
135:11	147:7 234:2,13	254:21	151:2 159:10	assuring 256:6
America 66:19	applications 18:4	areas 19:3 37:3	165:5,19 166:3,15	attend 80:7 117:21
<b>American</b> 6:14	19:21 68:13 103:8	46:1,3 53:16 77:5	178:4,7,12,13,14	135:19
10:9 231:19 232:7	105:20 121:16	103:5,6 107:6	178:15 179:3	Attendance 72:7
239:6 260:10	122:3 147:4	120:11 141:9	193:7 197:14,16	236:7
<b>amount</b> 14:18	148:13 234:3,6,22	178:3 179:10	197:17,20 198:2,4	attended 52:10
90:16	259:5	182:2 183:22	198:9 208:11,17	132:22 173:5
<b>Ana</b> 2:6 3:7,19 9:5	<b>applied</b> 14:15 75:3	187:1 188:9	211:8 260:16	268:8
11:9 18:18 42:4	114:9	205:17 257:18	264:7	attendees 128:13
89:8 93:13 99:11	applies 167:17	argumentatively	assessments 87:2,9	attending 66:16
101:3 123:18	apply 17:16 18:13	205:11	88:15 89:22 91:11	attention 32:17
124:21 125:4,15	145:2 147:9 166:1	Arlington 262:8	92:21 93:1,11	36:18 52:6 63:18

	I			
91:2 118:16	<b>aware</b> 146:10	<b>bands</b> 100:1	105:21 112:16	163:20 176:12
129:16 135:6	161:10	<b>bang</b> 34:2	113:3 175:19	178:21 193:15
143:10 258:13	awareness 151:2	<b>banners</b> 237:19	194:20 201:17	210:6,10,17 211:3
at-risk 116:4	156:16,17 157:4,4	<b>bar</b> 76:14,15 86:10	208:17 213:2,3,18	211:3,10,11
241:10 244:20	158:3 169:13,15	86:15	benchmarking	212:19 213:5,10
245:1	169:17,21 171:3	<b>base</b> 32:18 39:9	47:9	214:10 215:19
audience 45:19	171:14 179:11	48:4 51:3 52:8	beneficial 261:9	216:3,14 225:3,8
124:8 140:5	188:19 220:2	54:21	<b>benefit</b> 134:10	232:3 234:18
Auditorium 1:19	awfully 121:14	<b>based</b> 16:6 37:18	156:2 157:8	240:3 254:13
August 18:15	<b>AYP</b> 203:4	39:8 97:8 116:19	183:14 228:20	255:11
147:10 172:22	A-F-T-E-R-N-O	121:9 164:5	252:4	birth-through-gr
236:11	137:1	165:19 166:2,14	benefits 232:9	210:2
authored 151:22	<b>a.m</b> 1:20 8:2	174:9 177:7	233:21 255:19	birth-through-12
authority 257:7	101:19,20 136:21	185:10 195:11	benefitting 70:11	121:5
authorized 24:2		196:2 198:11	215:13	<b>birth-to</b> 143:3
255:7	B	201:3,18 202:2	best 32:3 34:2	birth-to-grade-12
automatically	<b>B</b> 212:21	206:17 257:14	105:15 109:16	144:10 253:10
133:6,15 157:17	<b>babies</b> 236:13	<b>basic</b> 13:12 74:2	181:21 212:20	birth-to-pre-K
171:11	237:12 238:5	84:5,12 88:20	223:12	217:17
automaticity	<b>baby</b> 77:19 237:22	260:18	<b>better</b> 48:2 59:13	<b>birth-to-12</b> 264:20
157:15 160:16	238:19,22	basically 14:13	62:22 98:22	<b>birth-to-3</b> 213:16
automatized	bachelor's 150:11	15:21 17:19 18:12	128:19 131:20	<b>birth-to-5</b> 265:13
161:16	<b>back</b> 12:18 18:16	119:8 142:19	180:19 184:4	<b>bit</b> 15:22 17:11
<b>avail</b> 198:20	41:16 48:7 49:10	144:22 146:19	191:11 226:7,13	19:18 27:5 51:18
availability 255:9	80:13 83:21 89:4	205:7 245:5,8	230:8 267:3	54:22 74:4 89:19
available 110:5	96:3 101:16,20	<b>basis</b> 33:6 36:17	<b>beyond</b> 25:19 29:2	90:1 94:10 97:14
149:13 189:9,11	105:1 136:10,11	130:12 200:8	30:10 32:10 52:16	108:4 122:22
195:10 204:22	136:22 142:2	227:2	56:7 83:11 92:10	124:3 125:8 135:3
238:1 239:15	147:12 148:5	beautiful 236:12	108:7 126:17	146:20 147:2
255:5 264:10	164:20 173:8	Becoming 24:5	134:20 240:18	154:11 155:8
268:4	186:16 220:21	<b>began</b> 115:5 152:22	<b>big</b> 27:12,12 81:17	183:7 192:14
average 87:6	221:13 225:18	172:19	82:3,20 83:18	194:13 198:17
131:14,20 230:3	231:1,6,12	beginning 34:10	84:15,20 91:7,9	213:21 215:7
260:5	background 23:5	47:6 65:14 151:3	<b>bigger</b> 187:12	216:2 219:2,3
avoid 36:11 56:9	40:11 74:15,22	163:20 173:7	biggest 143:2	227:8
121:10	75:1 81:4 90:15	187:12 190:9,10	Bilingual 10:20	<b>black</b> 69:20 139:10
<b>avoids</b> 36:11	97:17 98:9 106:10	230:11 263:10	<b>billion</b> 123:12	<b>Blacks</b> 260:17
award 10:12 23:13	158:7,16,17,20	<b>begins</b> 88:15	<b>bio</b> 10:22 42:8	<b>blanket</b> 62:15,15
23:14,17 65:6,11	159:2	232:15	biology 228:2	<b>blessed</b> 194:14
139:9,10,13	backgrounds 64:20	<b>begun</b> 177:2	229:5	196:20 205:5
145:19,22 147:9	69:7	<b>behalf</b> 123:21	<b>birth</b> 3:16 13:20	blocks 85:5
153:17,18	backmap 211:22	behavior 266:14	15:3 16:20 26:10	<b>blue</b> 70:2
awarded 17:20	backmapped	behaviors 78:4	67:15 77:12	<b>board</b> 24:15 42:15
146:21	211:16	238:3	100:10,10 103:5	132:13 226:19
awards 14:4,14,16	<b>bad</b> 164:3	behold 76:3	103:10 105:19	239:2 252:19
15:20 18:14 123:9	<b>balanced</b> 81:15,16	<b>belief</b> 245:11	121:2 143:6	253:3
139:5 145:3	<b>band</b> 100:6,7	believe 41:21	144:13 146:4	<b>boards</b> 6:22 139:4

		]	]	]
252:16,17,20	<b>bring</b> 74:14 97:13	C	careers 65:15	32:4,7 38:5 68:2
<b>body</b> 40:7 59:6	107:16 141:14	C 212:21	<b>careful</b> 39:16 98:6	74:9 82:17 85:3
116:10 199:15	162:10 209:1	California 10:1,10	99:4	88:6 130:4 132:8
bonfire 91:8	258:13 267:21	11:2 262:7	carefully 34:18	132:10,22 201:8
<b>book</b> 127:19 151:5	bringing 109:6	<b>call</b> 3:2 13:8 47:16	79:20 94:2 191:18	201:13 202:21
261:8	131:13 215:5	52:14 94:11	211:1 217:20	212:15 261:17
<b>books</b> 53:19 150:18	<b>brings</b> 99:15	172:22 257:21	226:19 264:10	267:20
238:3,14,20 239:2	214:22	<b>called</b> 50:21 105:7	caregiver 126:4	certified 227:17
266:5 267:1	British 66:9	122:15,17 197:15	caregivers 28:5	Cesarano 4:17
<b>border</b> 92:10	<b>broad</b> 45:1 139:15	223:7 237:11	125:11 266:15	118:17,18
<b>bore</b> 92:15	141:6 179:21	251:19	<b>Carl</b> 2:4 5:9,21	cetera 87:8 257:2
<b>born</b> 67:17,18	184:20 225:2	<b>calling</b> 154:9 161:2	138:7 147:12	<b>chain</b> 170:5,8,13
69:13 72:6,18	253:15	Campaign 247:10	Carnegie 43:15	<b>Chair</b> 43:17,19
73:7 84:7	<b>broadening</b> 261:10	campaigns 130:1	224:14	chaired 43:10
<b>bottom</b> 164:22	broader 109:11	Canada 66:6	Carolina 138:22	challenge 26:17
171:13 201:21	<b>broken</b> 170:10,12	candidates 180:19	139:7,17	34:3 97:16 128:2
boundary 247:22	Brooklyn 237:10	cap 111:5	carrying 206:19	143:6,7
boundary-crossing	237:11	capability 129:16	case 70:22 72:19	challenges 99:15
248:2	<b>Brother</b> 238:18	capably 46:19	75:15 146:14	109:10 264:12
<b>boy</b> 169:16	brought 126:5	capacities 42:22	259:7	chance 237:1
<b>brain</b> 266:2	175:15 202:11	181:5	cases 78:8 80:8	258:10
brand-new 59:12	<b>buck</b> 34:2	<b>capacity</b> 5:18 37:13	86:19 245:7	<b>change</b> 52:13 62:3
105:18 107:14	<b>buffering</b> 80:5	58:19,20 85:16	categorical 201:10	62:21 78:4,16
breadth 158:11	<b>build</b> 14:21 83:18	109:17 112:18	204:1	83:11 100:18
<b>break</b> 98:17 101:9	88:18 98:9 99:2	160:18 185:15	categories 190:13	245:11
101:10 124:11	106:10,11 123:10	186:3,4 187:18	caught 56:22	changes 112:14
148:2,4	142:20 144:9	191:7 225:4 235:5	cause 100:12	186:11
breakdown 16:13	213:3 222:20	241:22 242:3	cautionary 39:11	chaotic 79:6
171:13	254:20 260:2	246:8 252:22	Cecil 150:22	chapters 151:5
breaking 204:14	building 37:13	254:4,8 255:13	cell 21:6 149:15	characteristics
breakout 143:19	45:15 80:10 81:3	capacity-building	center 1:19 120:17	16:2 45:6 145:11
breakouts 16:19	85:16 97:17	85:9	123:4 176:18	245:1
breaks 170:8	129:17 170:19	capitalize 71:13	197:6	charitable 258:4
bridge 253:9	232:18 246:7	<b>captions</b> 6:23 258:3	centered 200:1	cheating 56:22
254:12,20	buildings 76:16	258:12,15,16	centering 205:6	check 101:15
Bridging 24:11	<b>builds</b> 185:2	259:7,16,17,22	centers 26:4 63:6	161:12 164:22
brief 20:17 29:5	built 111:5	260:2,11,15 261:6	224:2 235:14,14	165:11
141:10 142:13	<b>bullet</b> 208:1	261:21	central 130:6 139:7	<b>checking</b> 166:10,11
149:5 209:13	bullets 200:1	car 165:2,4,8,9	century 51:5,7,9,9	checks 208:15
<b>briefly</b> 13:3 14:7	<b>burden</b> 35:16	card 229:7	51:12 57:16,18	Chief 235:4
147:13 148:10	184:8 186:17	cards 262:1	66:19 232:17	<b>child</b> 27:15 39:6,7
205:3 265:7	191:15,22	care 33:16 129:10	265:17	66:2 68:21 77:20
<b>bright</b> 172:12	bus 237:19	134:5 248:17	certain 69:2 133:5	110:19 172:8
<b>BrightStart</b> 108:10	<b>business</b> 250:5	career 65:11 104:2	133:15 187:1	245:12 254:12
112:5 241:2,16,17	busy 8:10,10 28:16	153:1 204:17	243:6	256:12
245:9	butter 97:3	248:19 249:21	certainly 26:8	<b>childcare</b> 224:2
<b>brilliant</b> 95:9		250:20 256:7	28:10 29:14 30:9	242:17 243:15

	İ	Ī	İ	i
childhood 2:2 3:4	264:2 266:6,13,21	classroom-based	239:5 241:1	255:14
3:12 4:22 5:6,15	266:22	189:18	colleagues 50:21	comments 108:15
23:18 24:10 26:4	children's 28:2	classroom-level	118:1 124:18	108:17 148:6
26:15,21 28:15	75:15 107:22	110:19	192:6,16 194:12	192:16 241:18,19
33:15 44:5,7 62:9	232:14 235:10	<b>clear</b> 67:13 86:14	199:12 203:13	263:2 267:19
109:2,6,13 146:1	238:17 240:14	89:1 190:4,12	207:4 212:11	<b>commit</b> 117:12,18
150:14 158:9	<b>child's</b> 39:20,21	192:19 196:11	213:18 266:2	117:21
163:22 219:2	155:17 167:19	219:4 234:6	colleague's 213:7	commitment 108:6
235:11,12 253:8	233:1	clearance 18:5,9	<b>collect</b> 262:21	109:5 240:18
255:7 257:10	choices 63:3	clearly 74:12	collected 116:20	committed 111:20
267:7	<b>choose</b> 238:20	close 20:22 71:11	123:8	176:16 240:20
<b>children</b> 24:7 27:17	257:3	123:19 125:22	collecting 123:3	Committee 24:1
28:17 29:3,18	Chorus 140:4	closely 78:21 110:7	collection 185:13	42:12 43:11
36:6 38:17 55:8,8	Christakis 261:2	182:6 211:1 212:3	195:14 223:9	committees 31:3
65:2 66:20 67:7	churches 237:17	217:21 225:15	<b>college</b> 226:20	<b>common</b> 36:22
67:16 68:4 69:5	circling 40:15	226:19,21 227:6	228:2 256:6	37:9 43:4 44:22
69:13 70:11 72:14	<b>cite</b> 261:4	242:19 253:8	colleges 225:21	45:21 46:11 48:13
76:5 78:15 84:15	Citizens 247:13	<b>closer</b> 79:8 80:6	226:10	56:13 82:18 85:4
84:22,22 87:16,22	City 66:5	closing 112:22	college-readiness	91:22 94:9 188:4
91:12 108:6,9	<b>civil</b> 205:19	254:5	248:20	188:7,10,22
111:2,12 112:9	claiming 49:3	<b>coach</b> 117:17 139:2	Columbia 6:16	205:12,22 206:14
113:8 114:20	<b>clarity</b> 175:15	200:19	7:20 66:9 235:5,7	206:21 208:12
126:2 129:12	class 53:18 97:17	coaches 184:14	240:5 265:3	211:17 256:1,13
130:5,12,18 131:8	139:14 229:19	coaching 115:11	combined 32:14	communication
133:3 134:20	230:12	<b>coal</b> 214:5	102:7	45:2 74:2 84:5
139:9 143:10	classes 250:8	Coalition 247:11	come 12:18 30:1	communities 66:20
144:13 154:18	classification 89:2	Coast 72:19,20	41:16 72:7 102:12	67:19 90:20,20
155:22 156:18,19	classified 132:14	<b>code</b> 69:22 81:10	102:13 105:1,9	112:8 232:13
157:12 158:15	classroom 16:6	103:2	148:5 160:9 163:4	253:4
159:15 161:21	23:7 26:4 29:8	<b>coded</b> 75:16	187:20 201:10	community 33:19
162:5 163:1,2	38:6,12 43:21	code-based 87:4	204:13 227:15	35:16 77:12,22
164:7 172:6	44:7 50:9,12 76:2	<b>coding</b> 75:12	229:13 231:1,6	87:13 112:2,9,21
173:13,17,19,21	110:11 114:8	cognitive 47:7,11	235:8 239:2 264:5	128:8 131:22
174:1,9,12,18	115:12,13 117:22	cohesive 121:15	comes 38:15 51:14	189:3,6,19 233:11
175:22 176:1,2	119:1 134:8,14	193:6	61:5 84:8 122:13	235:14 236:13
179:10 189:22	135:5 139:1	collaborate 223:15	172:12	248:22 249:8
191:12 210:14,14	145:16 152:10	223:16 224:1	comfortable 53:15	250:4 257:13
211:3,5 214:9	184:18 193:1	226:18 253:8	coming 9:20 45:8	265:6
225:8 232:11	195:2 226:3	collaboration	136:10 137:4	community-based
233:4 235:12,13	228:16	36:19 45:11	163:7 212:10	35:8 128:13 180:8
236:13 237:1	classrooms 64:21	247:12 255:15	226:10 230:5	247:8 248:8
238:6,12,13 239:8	73:17 75:14 85:6	257:17 262:15	comment 112:15	250:10
240:17,20 241:8,9	96:5 103:13 104:1	collaborative 45:9	124:6 130:9	company 122:22
241:14 242:10	104:1,14 106:10	179:15 192:22	135:14 213:7,21	compare 73:14
244:3,7,10 248:10	107:17 114:10,21	205:4,15 246:18	231:1 258:10	189:1
253:7 255:10,20	115:21 117:13	248:6	262:11	compelling 249:19
260:5,21 263:1	123:4 189:2 260:8	colleague 202:10	commentary	competed 144:19
			_	_
		•		·

			İ	I
competencies	159:12,17,19	224:5	Connecticut's	85:7 91:17 92:4
225:19	160:7,9,15,18	concepts 55:16	116:1	103:18,22 106:11
competition 1:4	162:12 169:6,10	81:18 82:4,6	connecting 217:16	107:6 177:16
12:4 15:12 120:20	170:3 171:12	84:17 86:9 115:11	connection 168:9	178:3 182:2 188:9
140:14 147:8	179:12 193:12	117:1 175:14	179:3 180:21	189:4,7 193:16
182:1,3	222:4 258:22	188:6	connections 80:6	205:17 206:6
competitions	comprehensive 1:3	conceptual 81:13	192:21 219:5	221:2 230:9
146:12	5:13 12:20 13:17	155:7	connects 168:7	260:22 261:3
competitive 14:2	15:7,8 17:22	conceptualizing	206:12	content-based 85:2
15:10 18:2 143:17	20:10 25:12 49:22	223:21	consider 40:18	content-driven
144:17 145:7,8	54:7 63:5 72:2	concern 94:6	41:7 49:20 100:17	83:6
complete 72:4	122:15,17 137:17	247:17	120:3 131:3 169:5	context 51:6 225:3
185:21 186:10	140:15 142:15,20	concerned 111:4	174:14 242:6	258:20 261:3
241:12	143:15 144:8,11	concerns 171:10	243:20 267:8	263:2
completed 115:15	147:1 148:21	concert 102:19	consideration	continually 168:20
186:14 187:8	151:19 154:12,15	conclude 267:11	119:15 249:3	181:13
completing 59:3	154:20 155:12,20	conclusion 4:20	267:20	<b>continue</b> 52:5,17
187:7 188:1	157:21 159:5	257:9	considerations	93:7 167:18 174:8
complex 86:9	162:14,18 164:11	conclusions 62:19	26:7 119:5 175:7	174:14 236:21
116:11 155:8	169:14 173:22	concurrently 27:17	189:14	<b>continued</b> 4:1,2 5:1
159:20 264:15	175:20 176:7	condition 54:4	considered 35:20	6:1 7:10,13 88:21
complicated 13:7	177:11 178:4,11	conditions 52:22	90:19 214:5 259:3	continuity 223:4
component 14:2,3	181:6 186:5 188:5	conduct 58:20	considering 154:16	224:4
39:2 143:17 177:6	189:16 193:17	conducted 74:4	155:13 174:17	continuous 54:12
178:5,22 179:18	195:8 197:12	114:20 115:8	218:17 260:22	189:10
181:2	198:22 199:10,21	166:15 219:1	consist 8:13	Continuously
components 16:3	200:7 201:9 202:8	263:15	consistency 41:2	122:18
33:3,4 113:19	202:13,18 203:6	conducting 262:12	223:4 224:5	continuum 253:10
175:6,19 176:6	203:15,19 204:1	262:14	consistent 115:7	254:13,21
181:3 182:13	209:1 210:13	conflict 119:12	244:17	contribute 123:14
183:6 185:16,22	212:5 216:14,20	conforming 208:7	consistently 266:11	Contribute 123.14 Contributions
187:3 193:19,21	212.5 210.14,20	Congress 14:11	consortia 94:7	23:17
194:4,10 206:2	234:10 240:1	24:2 264:18	95:10 96:16	control 54:11
	246:14 253:1,18			control 54:11 convened 1:18
207:6 223:12 241:7 242:6 254:3	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	congressional 120:21	Consortium 247:13	
	254:3 257:2,15 258:8	conjunction 102:17	constantly 195:7 constraints 120:21	convenient 61:8 conventions 177:19
Comprehend 46:4				
comprehenders	comprehensively	203:7 234:22	constructive 91:14	conversation 84:8
74:10	208:1	connect 110:15	91:16	87:18 222:9
comprehending	<b>comprise</b> 193:19	209:2 225:14	consultant 23:7	230:16
161:14	comprised 199:4	258:18	Consulting 2:12	conversational
comprehension	computer 38:15	connected 167:16	4:4 21:18	74:1 84:3
71:22 73:3,6,9	computers 58:3,9	170:22 171:1	contact 13:9 21:13	conversations
76:7 79:18 81:22	computer-assisted	182:6 194:10	149:19	186:15,22 187:14
82:9 86:21 116:7	55:17	227:6	content 36:21 37:3	convey 181:19,21
142:5 155:1,3,5	conceived 127:12	Connecticut	39:10 45:12,15	conveying 182:2
155:10 156:14,16	concentrate 212:16	113:13 114:1,13	46:1,2 53:16	Cooper 6:15 235:3
157:20 159:6,10	concept 82:21	116:18	78:22 82:11,19	235:3

	İ		İ	I
cooperating 63:6	county 2:22 6:10	criteria 52:8 60:16	cutting 57:1	268:4
cooperative 63:14	10:20 138:22	242:14 244:18	<b>cycle</b> 164:15 165:4	day-to-day 84:8
coordinate 33:14	139:10 152:17	<b>critical</b> 9:9 46:7	168:13 169:4	151:11
223:16 224:1	153:1 198:2 199:4	81:12 108:20	C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S	<b>DCFS</b> 211:11
226:18	199:14,19 205:5	109:9,15 110:8	3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1	<b>de</b> 2:6 3:7,19 9:5
coordinated 25:14	209:4 229:15	111:3,14 112:12	7:10	11:9 18:18 42:4
180:6	230:11	140:18 141:3		89:8 93:13 99:11
coordination 41:3	<b>couple</b> 13:19 55:3	175:5 176:7 178:2	<b>D</b>	101:3 123:18
235:17 254:17	89:14 108:21	178:5 185:18	<b>Dad</b> 238:19	124:21 125:4,15
255:10 257:5	127:22 206:22	200:21 202:7	<b>daily</b> 79:9 193:20	<b>dead-on</b> 213:19
Coordinator 150:9	222:20	203:8 205:2,18	247:19 248:14	deal 31:3,4 34:9
265:2	coupled 62:20	208:17 242:18	danger 78:14	57:13 68:15 78:21
copy 149:18	<b>course</b> 8:6 31:14	245:14,16 249:9	<b>Daniel</b> 150:20	<b>dealing</b> 40:1 61:1
core 36:22 37:9	32:17 33:8 39:8	254:2	Daniella 6:17	92:3 119:6,10
43:4 44:22 45:21	63:1 70:6,16 75:2	critically 56:18	240:12	<b>Dean</b> 23:20
46:11 47:1,21	75:17 76:3 85:12	205:10,10	Daniel-Shaw	deans 226:22
48:13 56:13 82:18	86:19 98:11	critique 46:4	236:10	debate 83:2
85:4 91:22 94:9	129:19 136:17	cross 161:11	<b>data</b> 39:2 46:13	<b>Deborah</b> 1:21 2:2
117:5 120:11	198:12 221:3,4	crossing 248:1	71:1,2 73:13	3:2,10 4:21 5:5,14
121:18 175:19	226:6,9 228:22	crucial 185:18	89:17,21 107:12	8:15 11:10 12:18
176:6 183:5 188:7	235:15 236:9	253:20 257:10	116:20 123:2,3,7	19:18 20:3 22:11
188:10,22 205:12	261:14	cultural 29:17	132:20 166:6	99:12 123:19
205:22 206:14,21	courses 228:5	64:20 67:6 68:11	167:19 168:20	140:2 142:2,7
211:17 242:6	249:15	68:16 131:4	178:8 180:3	153:20 154:9
256:1,13	courtesy 21:10	culturally 76:22	183:13,21 184:3,9	175:3 192:8
Corporation 43:7	cover 15:2,3 54:3	cultures 46:20	185:11,13 189:9	209:22 215:15
43:15	141:9	curious 40:10	191:11,14 194:7	<b>decade</b> 121:21
<b>correct</b> 46:17	co-authored	current 181:12	195:14,17 196:3,6	decades 265:16,16
213:19	150:17	217:1	196:13,19 197:2	decisionmaking
correcting 162:22	co-authors 150:20	currently 23:22	198:11 201:19	141:4 196:14
correlated 157:20	150:22	68:22 69:16	204:11	decisions 30:12
correlation 198:4	co-edited 44:4	152:15 184:2	database 88:10	33:6 39:5,8 123:3
cost-effective 110:5	crack 69:22	189:1 202:17	data-driven 117:14	168:21 194:3
<b>Council</b> 23:14 32:5	<b>craft</b> 201:17	248:10 251:16	daunting 25:7	195:19 198:11
33:15,16 43:15	<b>create</b> 14:22 162:6	262:12	day 8:10,12,13 12:1	<b>decode</b> 156:18,19
66:4 139:12	175:20 186:7,8	curricula 242:20	39:18 40:8 76:10	157:13,14,16,17
councils 255:7	214:8 239:9	curriculum 2:20	79:5 137:22	160:16
counter 54:20	created 14:10	6:9 35:1 38:11	177:15 192:6,17	decoding 157:9
122:6	185:16 217:5	61:13 70:12 104:4	193:21 208:13	161:3 170:2 171:5
counterparts 70:21	creating 71:17	117:5 120:11	224:12 236:15	171:6,15 179:12
countless 232:13	176:10 184:7,8	138:19 152:16	250:7 251:2,22	220:2 221:20
countries 259:17	185:5 188:19	177:7,9,13,15	260:6	decontexturalized
<b>country</b> 67:10	207:14 226:5	181:20 224:12	daycare 129:9	100:21
69:10 131:17	creation 205:21	233:18 243:16	130:6 235:14	dedicated 246:7
199:7 210:18	creative 111:6	<b>Curry</b> 2:15 6:5	266:21	deeply-complex
232:13 237:9	credits 224:14,15	136:2	days 57:7 98:18	141:7
<b>counts</b> 27:11	cringed 54:19	<b>cuts</b> 181:19	172:21 173:3,8	<b>defend</b> 121:7 122:7

deficiency 162:22	153:21 175:4	<b>develop</b> 12:3 18:7	150:8 151:19	264:11
<b>deficit</b> 161:17	183:11 192:8	19:21,22 20:3	170:17 179:22	differentiate
deficits 161:15	211:4,13 232:8	27:16 51:16 58:19	180:10,13 188:16	105:13 107:5
162:13 164:8	233:21 234:11,20	93:10 95:5 96:15	191:6 193:9,11	178:8
171:6	246:19 258:7	109:8 112:5 119:4	195:21 196:2	differentiated 29:4
definitely 130:2	259:20 261:13	143:15 144:4,6	201:4,12,18 208:4	53:21 61:15 131:4
143:9 244:19	262:10 263:5,7,11	147:7 148:12,14	211:7,13 220:21	133:1 190:16
definition 17:8	263:20 264:7	148:16 154:15	225:6 229:1 233:2	203:2
146:15	267:15	158:15 214:8	233:8 234:17	differentiation
definitions 55:22	departments 43:1	232:19 233:18	244:22 248:19	29:6 38:10
234:7	58:16 210:19	234:22 248:6	249:5 251:14	differently 71:13
<b>degree</b> 139:20	<b>Department's</b> 8:17	<b>developed</b> 18:1	252:2 254:2,12	difficult 28:13
150:11 153:5	253:12	49:22 94:14	252:2 254:2,12 255:17 256:3	73:10 119:15
deliberate 26:12	depending 196:5	119:16 225:19	257:1 266:6 267:7	166:20 216:7,10
28:20 30:15	201:15	developing 17:21	developmentally	difficulties 24:6
192:21	depends 15:18 18:5	90:6,7 94:7 97:2	37:19 38:1	65:19
deliberately 97:14	deploying 256:21	114:11 146:22	DeWitt 23:2	difficulty 140:21
184:12	depth 78:12 158:11	147:5 155:11	DHH 211:5	dig 125:8
delighted 25:2	<b>Deputy</b> 2:4,9 5:9	157:6 180:5	diagnose 165:7,19	dilemma 74:7
delinquency	5:22 22:13 138:9	181:12 184:3	169:7,8,12 170:15	<b>Dimitri</b> 261:1
248:18	138:18	185:4 211:6 242:3	178:19 222:1	direct 38:18 120:16
<b>deliver</b> 182:17	described 20:4	253:17	diagnosing 164:15	166:13,17 168:14
delivery 208:5	220:15 234:14	development 1:4	diagnosis 165:20	264:2 266:16
demand 37:10	255:13	2:14 3:14 4:6	229:1	directly 36:3 70:2
91:15,16	<b>describes</b> 206:12	16:4 22:4 26:15	dialog 83:2,17	<b>Director</b> 2:17 6:6
demands 45:19	description 17:17	27:7 28:3 31:10	257:21	6:21 114:4 151:9
206:13,17	design 55:6,16 68:2	36:1,2,4,6 37:12	<b>Dialogic</b> 127:18	152:3 153:10,13
demographics	71:12 72:10 77:14	37:22 41:9,12,15	dictionary 38:15	252:14 258:3,5
201:3	78:2 81:8 89:5	44:5 48:11,17	<b>differ</b> 188:9	directors 10:20
demonstrate 109:5	105:8 109:20	51:18,22 52:10,13	difference 143:3	123:5
109:17 243:9,17	183:22 205:4,7,14	52:15 53:3,10,13	161:7	disabilities 12:13
demonstrated 35:4	207:9 258:10	53:22 54:2,9,18	differences 134:17	15:5 23:8 29:16
104:14	262:21	55:2 60:17,20	different 12:11	55:9,12 136:4
demonstration	designed 39:17	61:18,20 62:10	13:18,20 17:3	141:19 144:16
104:8,11 114:14	77:9 116:12	64:5,15 65:17	31:16 46:1,1,2,2,3	150:8,22 151:1,7
denied 173:10	135:18 152:3	66:3,22 87:19	48:19 54:1,5	154:14,17,18
department 1:1,21	designs 208:7	88:3 90:2 103:22	61:20 64:2 72:16	156:1 160:1,2,4
2:1,17 3:5,9,13,21	desk 268:1	104:6,7,9,13	79:2,3,4,19 95:7	160:12,12 161:21
4:12,23 5:8,12,17	despite 49:2	105:1,22 106:16	97:6 100:2 128:13	162:6 163:13
5:24 6:7 8:17 9:7	detailed 10:21	107:10 108:19,20	141:17 142:22	165:18 168:6
9:9,20 11:6 12:1	103:10	109:14,18,22	143:13 155:9	172:2,6 173:15,18
19:6 20:14 42:21	details 14:12	113:17,20,22	162:12 187:10,11	173:20 174:7,10
62:11 102:7,10	determine 106:9	115:5 116:13,22	192:14 193:22	174:13,19 176:2
113:1 114:7	183:13 244:12	119:21 120:6	195:18 199:11,13	189:22 212:22
137:14 138:13	256:16 257:7	121:22 126:10	201:2 207:10	218:17,18 219:21
140:7,16 147:21	determining 242:4	127:6,12 135:9	212:2 216:19	247:4,14 251:20
151:10 152:1	detriment 173:13	140:13 145:12	222:14 223:2,2	disability 160:19
	ı	<u> </u>	1	1

		I	I	ı
163:12 172:9	9:22,22 10:1	<b>divide</b> 100:2,11	66:11 89:8 90:9	241:3
173:12 228:17	34:20 98:17	divided 100:3	92:8 93:13 94:5	<b>D'Emilio</b> 125:6,19
246:18,20	102:19 128:17	division 204:16	95:14,15,17 97:11	125:19
disadvantaged	135:3 138:16,17	239:7	98:13 99:11,21	<b>D.C</b> 1:20
175:22 190:1	139:2 152:19,20	doctorate 66:7	101:3 116:7	
discipline 45:20	153:13 173:10	139:16	123:18 124:21	<b>E</b>
disciplines 46:3	193:1 194:22	document 47:22	125:1,4,15,21	<b>eager</b> 63:11
49:1 53:11	195:12 196:15	50:21 102:2	127:4,22 130:8	<b>Earl</b> 153:17
discipline-free	198:1,19,20 199:1	documentation	132:7 133:1 134:4	earlier 61:15 141:1
53:12	199:7,17,18 200:3	30:16	134:19 138:7,9,17	148:19 196:18
disconcerting 71:4	200:5,9,10 201:2	documents 121:15	138:20 139:1	earliest 25:6 27:10
discourse 83:3,17	201:13 207:20	121:19 122:2,4,5	140:2 147:13	30:10
118:15 205:20	209:3 212:10	doing 17:4 28:10	150:3,4,9,17	early 2:2,8 3:4,12
discover 187:21	218:1,4 235:4,6	35:18 40:9 75:12	151:8,8,18,20	4:22 5:6,15 9:14
discretionary	236:4,7 240:5	87:11 89:18 91:12	152:2,8 153:17,22	15:21 17:13 21:22
232:7 234:1,9	265:3	91:19,21 96:18	154:5,6 175:2	23:17 24:3,9
discuss 12:10 14:6	<b>districts</b> 14:5 15:20	99:9 102:15	179:8 188:8	25:19 26:4,15,21
19:2 84:1 141:15	92:18 102:16,17	105:12 122:8	192:12 199:5	27:6,7,9 28:14
175:5	134:22 143:7	128:7,16 129:8	209:9,16 210:16	29:1,2 33:15
discussion 11:8	172:5 173:16	130:21 181:20	212:9 213:20	37:20 44:4,6 62:9
12:8 19:5 85:16	178:16 182:10	182:12 189:15	215:15 216:12	65:11 70:8 81:10
135:11 147:20	183:21 184:6,8	191:13,17 202:15	218:16 220:5,20	87:2,6 102:8
209:13	185:8 188:14	203:8 207:12	222:19,21 224:16	108:8,12 109:2,2
disengage 131:21	190:13 191:16,19	214:1 215:1,7,12	224:22 225:14	109:6,6 110:8
disengaged 249:10	194:17 195:6,10	217:14 223:18	227:7 230:14	111:17,20 113:3
displays 55:18	196:10,22 197:9	227:8 235:9	<b>draft</b> 211:10,19	115:17 121:21
disseminate 98:4	197:17 199:3,5	259:19 263:7	217:15	126:16 129:10,13
253:13	202:14 204:15	dollars 121:8	drafted 211:16	129:22 143:8
disseminated	207:8 209:5 221:7	123:12 201:10	drafting 259:4	146:1,14,16 150:8
253:22	224:3 253:2,6	203:18 204:1,8,19	<b>drafts</b> 217:12	150:14 154:2
disseminating	256:8,15	264:1,5,6,9	<b>drive</b> 180:3 189:10	155:14,14,18
182:15 257:1	districtwide 54:10	<b>domain</b> 123:9	196:14 202:5	156:6,13 158:4,9
dissemination	162:18	domains 79:4	<b>driven</b> 85:7 123:3	163:11,11,14,19
259:10	district's 10:7	<b>door</b> 53:7 76:3	driving 29:10	163:22 164:4
distance 238:16	208:21	128:22	182:4	173:18 210:9
distinctions 97:1,9	<b>District-level</b> 34:6	doors 232:21	<b>dropped</b> 249:10	212:20 214:9
distinguished	<b>diverse</b> 3:17 5:19	<b>Dorothy</b> 2:18 3:23	<b>DSS</b> 211:4	217:3 219:2
10:16 11:20 21:21	64:19 109:22	21:20 22:22	<b>dual</b> 227:14	221:14 222:21
23:20 153:16	175:8 189:14	105:14 134:13	dually-endorsed	224:1,2 234:17
distinguishes 46:13	190:3,5,19 201:1	double-dosing	227:16	235:12 236:11
distractions 21:8	204:6 210:5,15	224:10,13	<b>dull</b> 118:13	240:22 253:6,8
distribute 183:1	242:1 244:15,20	double-duty 96:10	duration 78:3,18	254:14 255:6
distributed 237:14	245:1,4,16 246:15	<b>Dr</b> 3:7,19,23 4:3,5	117:22	257:10 265:20
237:16	253:16	5:9,21 6:4,6 9:4	<b>Durham</b> 138:15	266:7,19 267:6
distribution 17:1,7	diversity 29:17	9:12,21 11:1,9	<b>DVD</b> 51:15	earned 11:1 66:6
146:6	67:6 68:12,15,17	18:17,18 24:18	dynamic 193:6	earning 65:5
<b>district</b> 6:16 7:20	68:17 86:15	42:4 44:10 64:10	dyslexia 108:12	ears 169:16

			1	
easier 45:17 53:17	180:17,22 214:7	243:11 244:12	elements 34:22	223:19 260:1
easily 260:12	221:3 225:16	254:18	35:2 39:12 99:18	263:4,11 264:9,11
East 72:20	226:22 227:11,13	<b>effects</b> 76:11,12	113:19 187:14	encouraged 186:20
easy 50:16 61:6,7	227:16,18 228:4,9	efficiently 73:2	199:22 255:2	234:21
127:17 181:22	228:10 232:15,17	<b>effort</b> 25:11 32:14	<b>elevate</b> 78:5 123:16	encourages 232:8
196:7 226:8,12	234:12,20,21	33:12 34:17 35:10	130:3 263:5	endorsed 122:5
echo 192:5	238:11 246:9	38:5 40:20 41:3	elevated 122:10	228:13
economic 64:20	248:3 254:13	63:14 101:1	123:5	endorsement
68:12,17 69:6	258:7 259:21	129:17 131:22	elevating 76:14	227:14,21 229:20
214:8	261:13 263:20	142:3 177:1 184:1	86:9,15 263:13	230:7
economically-div	265:12 267:7	187:17 191:21	<b>eligible</b> 10:3 15:13	end-of-year 76:6
77:1	educational 6:19	192:22 214:22	17:9,12 144:20	<b>engage</b> 130:12
ed 104:2 114:7	9:16 10:16 33:19	215:5 216:21	146:10,13,15	131:9 222:12
131:17 149:3	43:12,18 44:1	259:18	eliminate 184:7	250:8 251:20
227:21,21 228:14	47:15 52:4 62:2	<b>efforts</b> 45:9,13	191:22 207:3,10	engaged 126:13
228:14	63:5 66:7 139:6	113:22 115:16	eliminating 186:17	175:16,17 186:14
<b>edition</b> 150:20	139:12,13 153:6	151:13 175:16	191:15 207:13	187:6,13,22 191:9
Educate 189:3	246:6 259:18	180:1,2 182:5,14	Ellen 7:16 262:5	211:13 222:15
educated 72:19	260:16 261:10	184:17 186:4	<b>ELLs</b> 84:11 88:17	engagement 128:19
73:7 172:13	educationally-rich	187:2,4 200:5	<b>email</b> 136:16	129:3,6 189:19
education 1:1,21	191:2	227:1 234:5	174:21	245:21 249:7
2:1,3,5,7,10,13,14	educator 10:19	253:13 265:13	emailed 136:16	engaging 38:3
2:14,16,17 3:5,5,9	23:13,15 62:10	267:9	embarking 200:6	110:3 186:22
3:9,13,13,21,21	99:6 121:22 139:9	eighth 69:16 72:18	<b>embed</b> 189:8	246:3
4:4,6,8,12,23,23	educators 84:14	72:22 73:5 152:19	249:14	<b>engine</b> 164:22
5:7,8,11,12,16,17	109:3,7,22 126:11	199:6	embedded 31:12	165:1,10,15
5:23,24 6:5,7 8:17	126:21 189:12	<b>either</b> 14:19 104:14	41:13 53:10 69:11	166:10
8:18 9:7,15 15:14	235:11 250:17	136:14 144:4	196:12 208:3	Engineers 65:12
19:6 20:14 21:19	252:5	195:22 227:19	<b>embody</b> 118:14	<b>English</b> 10:4 12:12
22:1,5,6,14,15	<b>effect</b> 59:10 266:4	<b>ELA</b> 42:18 206:7	embraces 45:1	15:4 23:4,14
23:2,18 24:2,15	<b>effective</b> 16:2 33:9	elaborate 94:3	embracing 126:7	29:15 32:5 39:10
26:9,20,22 30:1	43:21 68:2 106:13	elaborating 47:19	<b>Emerita</b> 2:18 3:24	65:8 70:5,17,19
33:15 34:22 42:10	110:3 120:2	electives 224:14	21:21 23:2	72:3 73:16 84:13
42:16,21 43:1	145:11 176:12	element 33:11	emphasis 26:14	85:6,18 125:12,20
58:17 64:15,16	177:11 178:12	39:15 200:4	56:14 88:3 190:11	133:7 141:18
66:1,8 67:20 86:1	185:7,8 193:8	elementary 2:2,5,6	247:4	144:15 233:5
86:5 102:7 113:1	194:21 195:1	2:9 3:4,8,12,20	emphasize 175:18	<b>English-proficient</b>
120:4,17 128:3	207:16 229:14	4:22 5:6,10,15,23	Employment	68:6
136:2 137:14,15	242:15 243:3	8:18 9:6,14 22:14	246:20 247:11	English-speaking
138:12 139:17,19	250:16 251:7	26:21 49:17 60:3	Empowering	70:20 71:9
139:20 140:7	252:10 256:16	103:13 109:3,7	229:13	<b>enhance</b> 14:20,22
142:4 147:21	257:8	137:15 138:12	encompasses	144:5,7 196:21
150:5,12,14,15	effectively 239:11	142:3 150:12	109:19	enhancing 191:6
151:10,21 152:14	249:12 255:22	159:13 219:1,14	encountered	197:3
153:10,14 172:15	effectiveness 59:22	222:2 223:10	248:13	enrolling 68:4
173:12,14 174:11	99:6,6 181:11	227:19 228:6,20	encourage 111:6	ensure 110:2
174:15 175:4	184:11 234:16	229:3	111:10,18,22	116:14 166:21

174 12 101 10		c1 0 10c 14	140.20	166 17
174:13 181:18	essential 49:20	61:9 126:14	140:20	explanation 166:17
188:5 191:5 193:2	51:12 113:18	182:20,21 236:16	execution 116:15	explicit 38:13
207:7 232:6,16	115:10 194:4	237:5	Executive 258:3	45:22 166:13
234:13	254:5	everyday 36:17	existing 14:20	167:1,2 168:6
ensuring 67:5	essentially 47:11	<b>evidence</b> 3:15 30:5	expand 86:5	179:16
177:3 202:12	144:2	30:13 35:19 46:12	265:13	explicitly 109:15
enter 111:13 221:6	establish 33:13	46:16 48:4 49:5	expanded 25:5	234:14
228:3	184:13 191:11	58:8,13,18 59:1	115:16	exploding 105:7
enters 123:9	253:14	60:4 105:15	expanding 190:10	exploration 249:22
entertaining	established 100:1	112:16,18 164:4	expect 8:7 238:5	250:20
261:10	108:11 206:13	174:8 243:8,11	expectation 177:8	exposed 75:22
entire 33:12 58:4	216:18 217:8	evidence-based	expectations 20:18	extend 235:22
183:3 217:22	218:4 232:2 240:2	117:2 174:2 251:7	149:6 181:16	250:15 255:19
233:11 254:21	241:2	251:17	expected 174:7	extended 39:15
<b>entities</b> 15:13 17:13	establishing 114:12	evidence-informed	188:21	50:15 83:16
17:15 144:20	198:15 255:6	242:15	expensive 85:22	124:11 187:15
146:10,18 211:2	258:7	exact 186:1	86:2	190:21,22 224:11
entitled 113:16	estimated 111:12	<b>exactly</b> 8:5 26:18	experience 79:7	extends 108:7
<b>entity</b> 146:13	et 87:8 257:1	60:9 218:2,8	114:8 209:19	240:18
entrepreneurship	ethnic 131:5	235:9	237:2 252:1	extensive 116:11
250:5	Eunice 66:1	examining 177:7	253:16	extent 194:8
entry 255:11	<b>evaluate</b> 33:5 60:14	180:3	experienced 54:2,6	<b>extra</b> 36:17,18
environment 71:13	106:22 165:7	example 55:20	163:1	174:1
72:11 76:19 107:9	184:1 242:22	71:20 75:22 84:18	experiences 116:19	extremely 12:2
environments 75:7	244:11	91:15 121:20	155:14,15,16	20:6 48:5
78:6	evaluated 61:11	185:6,12 190:8,15	158:15 176:21	
equally 55:4	122:18	211:4 226:2	241:17 247:6	<u>F</u>
179:19	evaluation 3:15	227:22 238:9	250:1,21 253:7	faced 161:22
<b>equate</b> 164:19	16:18 53:2,4 62:1	255:5 259:7	267:1	facilitate 11:20
equation 98:10	62:21 64:5 105:3	<b>examples</b> 77:17,21	experimental 62:12	189:20
126:5	112:16 122:10,10	78:1 123:11 236:2	<b>expert</b> 1:7 2:11	facilitating 11:8
equitable 17:1	123:16 173:11	237:8 255:12	3:14 5:18 18:22	140:1
146:6	242:21 243:3	Excellence 10:13	19:2,5 20:15 40:6	facilitator 3:18
erroneous 245:3	262:15 263:6,10	10:17	147:16,18,20	5:20 8:20 9:3
<b>error</b> 161:6	263:14 264:4	excellent 41:19	149:3 150:7	137:12,19 138:8
<b>errors</b> 95:20	evaluations 62:13	42:16 74:1 77:13	153:19,22 154:4	140:10
escape 47:8	62:18 63:7 174:6	125:7 141:13	expertise 140:12	fact 45:14 55:15
<b>ESEA</b> 257:4	262:13 264:10	173:21 174:8	141:15 184:21	68:21 70:9,12
<b>ESL</b> 152:11	evaluator 27:6	221:1 239:5	185:2 209:20	71:5 76:10 78:2
especially 9:10	152:12	exceptional 72:3	217:6 230:9 255:4	78:10 79:5 83:21
28:14 39:13 87:15	<b>Eve</b> 172:7,8,10,20	150:19 153:14	255:12 264:15	114:18 119:11
90:18 107:11	173:7 174:18	exceptionally 86:22	experts 12:6,9	126:2 129:1
116:3 122:5	<b>evening</b> 268:11	129:18	137:20 141:13	132:15 134:12
125:10 128:1	<b>event</b> 140:1	excited 208:21	144:6 150:1 194:1	171:12 182:7
175:22 210:14,22	events 129:6	215:11	209:14	199:17 228:18
212:7 239:7 249:9	everybody 46:14	<b>exclude</b> 207:10	explain 97:18	238:7
266:6	53:6,6 55:10 60:7	<b>excuse</b> 110:14	207:2 258:21	<b>factor</b> 169:13 224:9

	1	1		i
<b>factors</b> 161:19	feasible 85:13	242:21 244:9	260:6	107:15 114:21
179:8	features 187:3	245:18	five-minute 101:9	143:5 158:4 196:5
faculty 42:9	February 18:4	<b>find</b> 53:5 72:21	148:3 230:22	201:12 222:4
<b>fail</b> 162:1 165:15	<b>fed</b> 94:5	75:2 76:5 80:17	five-year 65:6	<b>focuses</b> 64:18 161:9
260:18	<b>federal</b> 6:21 121:8	81:15 86:22 106:5	<b>fix</b> 126:9	<b>focusing</b> 25:18 26:2
<b>failed</b> 166:19	121:13 131:12	181:22 204:8,12	flaw 213:14	111:10 157:5
<b>failing</b> 171:2,5	151:15 234:3	249:18 250:22	flexibility 202:14	158:11 159:14
failure 113:4	252:15 256:11,20	<b>finding</b> 41:2 74:12	207:8 213:8	206:8 220:11
155:18 161:22	257:4,7,12 263:13	75:9,17 198:3	256:15 257:6	245:20
163:1,8,15 164:6	federal-level 119:7	findings 106:15	flexible 16:10	folks 9:1 96:1 99:4
241:10	feed 227:3,5	115:7	<b>floor</b> 148:1	128:12 136:6
failures 151:6	feedback 12:15	<b>fine</b> 97:1	Flora 66:3	138:3 184:20
<b>FAIR</b> 197:17,20	43:3 105:3 106:1	<b>finish</b> 149:13	Florida 4:12 102:6	185:3 187:11
198:7	106:4 141:21	finished 41:22	102:9 105:6	217:10 218:6,6
<b>fairly</b> 85:21 142:9	185:15	<b>Finland</b> 259:16	108:11 150:13,16	268:7
159:20 182:8	<b>feeder</b> 102:19	<b>firm</b> 262:6	152:18,22 153:5	<b>follow</b> 48:1 104:16
faith-based 128:9	103:4 107:8 223:9	<b>first</b> 18:20 19:20	195:14 197:6,15	174:10
<b>fall</b> 145:4 146:3	223:20 224:3	20:19 22:21 26:6	199:4,8 209:3	followed 19:4
190:8	<b>feel</b> 21:12 36:9	27:6,6 44:19	210:8 212:13	69:13 72:17
<b>falls</b> 84:22 170:11	102:2 177:2	46:10 48:3 52:21	213:17,19 229:8	147:19 150:13
170:13	194:14 222:14	59:1 68:7 69:12	<b>Florida's</b> 194:14	153:9
<b>Fame</b> 23:11	263:21	74:6 77:8 86:18	<b>flow</b> 102:18	following 69:17
familiar 108:3	<b>feeling</b> 25:10 32:13	86:20 99:14 102:4	<b>fluency</b> 156:20,21	116:21 168:17
217:12	feels 12:5,5	102:11 108:18	157:19,22 158:4	242:6
<b>families</b> 67:11,17	<b>fellow</b> 21:22 114:2	109:1 114:1,5,18	161:18 170:2	<b>follows</b> 254:9
78:9,15 87:16	Ferguson 23:16	114:21 116:2	171:11 179:12	followup 114:15
112:10 128:9	<b>fewer</b> 70:19 124:2	117:20 118:20	222:4	<b>follow-up</b> 115:11
129:11 180:9,14	134:8 221:18	119:2 120:18	fluently 157:18	125:2 208:4 220:6
215:11,13	236:8	128:3 139:14	<b>flyer</b> 238:1	<b>forces</b> 216:18 217:5
<b>family</b> 29:1 86:7	fidelity 208:15	140:6 143:2	<b>flyers</b> 237:14	217:6,10
128:18,19 129:3,5	243:18	148:11 150:3	<b>focal</b> 134:11	foregoing 101:18
131:22 172:13	<b>field</b> 150:7 214:5	154:21 156:8	focus 27:1 35:12	136:20 231:11
189:18 211:5	<b>fields</b> 246:9	172:20 176:9,21	53:14 80:20 88:16	0
238:16 259:12	<b>Fifteen</b> 236:17	185:22 187:20	92:22 101:1 103:8	forget 161:4
<b>far</b> 66:22 77:14	<b>fifth</b> 71:1,21 110:18	207:8 226:9	103:9 105:20	<b>form</b> 147:6 155:16
95:11 214:2	121:2 131:10	229:19 231:16	106:18 108:15	186:14
225:11 253:13	179:18,18	235:8 236:2,17	115:17 117:1	formal 49:16 88:20
<b>fast</b> 70:13	<b>fight</b> 64:1	239:1 240:5 241:7	126:11 131:13	89:22 155:19
faster 71:7,11	<b>figure</b> 17:6 99:22	242:2 259:4 263:4	143:9 159:16	156:3 179:22
fastest 68:8	203:22	267:13	160:3 161:3	211:9 213:4
fastest-growing	filled 115:21	fiscal 253:21	162:14,15,16,16	formalized 114:16
67:16	final 122:20 179:19	fit 47:4 97:7 117:8	163:20 187:3	format 49:17 92:3
fast-growing 67:12	<b>finalize</b> 120:19	<b>five</b> 16:21 47:17	193:9,11 207:16	100:16
fatal 213:14	144:22	50:6 65:5 101:9	208:3 213:12	<b>formative</b> 38:21
<b>favor</b> 45:10	finally 86:11,17	101:16 129:12	241:19 246:22	39:1 90:13 91:11
favorite 62:8	87:20 149:14	138:20 146:5	247:3	178:15 195:17
feasibility 114:6	189:13 241:11	176:5 231:2,10	<b>focused</b> 38:6 79:4	197:14 198:2
			<u> </u>	<u> </u>

208:15 262:21	256:5	funneled 201:14	215:2 228:19	<b>goes</b> 34:14 76:17
formats 177:18	frameworks 177:9	funny 127:6	229:20	99:22 111:4
former 23:6	Franklin 138:21	further 74:6 127:5	Gettman 6:21	131:11 143:14,15
forming 62:20	139:9	196:21 236:1	252:13,14	220:21 236:18
formula 14:2,16	frankly 28:16	256:9	gifted 131:3,8	going 8:13,19 13:2
17:20 143:13,20	79:15	<b>future</b> 110:9 246:3	132:2,12,14 139:8	14:6 17:9 21:15
146:21	Fred 261:2	FY2010 14:11	Gillis 4:15 113:10	25:7,9,14 27:1
<b>forth</b> 88:9 131:18	free 10:3 21:12		113:11	28:19 29:11 30:14
171:7	102:2 134:6	G	<b>Ginny</b> 6:15 235:3	30:18 31:7 32:13
forthcoming	174:14 199:16	gain 78:4 83:7	girl 172:12	34:3,11 36:16
234:10 263:6	258:16,22 260:14	87:18 154:22	give 13:12 20:5	38:22 44:17 45:3
Fortunately 260:22	266:13	155:1 156:19	21:3 23:19 45:3	47:3 48:10,18
forward 12:14 20:7	Freeny 7:19 265:1	159:15	47:18 55:18	51:4 54:12,15
37:11 108:22	265:2	<b>gained</b> 156:20	123:20 142:4,10	62:3,5 66:13,18
141:20 246:3	freestanding	gains 129:2,5	147:18 148:3,8	67:4 68:7,14 70:7
257:20	135:19	<b>game</b> 73:9	164:6 224:19	70:19 73:9 77:4
foster 86:13 248:16	frequently 251:11	gang 28:16	229:6 230:17	79:15 80:16 82:4
fostering 9:15	<b>FRIDAY</b> 1:12	gap 24:12 70:15,17	261:14 266:16	82:5,7 83:2,9,13
<b>found</b> 50:20 52:5	frightens 98:19	70:21 72:22	given 63:2 65:12	83:14,15,16 84:2
176:3,5 185:17	front 53:18 200:2	106:12	124:19 220:7	84:4,6,12 85:11
223:1,14 226:4	231:6	gaps 71:11 254:6	<b>giving</b> 130:20	86:4,7,12 88:2,9
233:14 234:2	frontline 218:6	Gates 205:6	197:1 258:9	90:18,22 95:4,12
245:2	<b>full</b> 173:11 174:6	<b>gather</b> 128:10	glacier 97:18	96:19 97:11 101:8
foundation 65:7	<b>fully</b> 68:6 117:10	140:12 166:6	<b>global</b> 58:4 95:1	106:4 124:11
66:4 107:21	257:13	167:18	<b>go</b> 8:6 13:2,14 14:3	133:7,19 134:16
155:16 156:2	<b>fun</b> 266:5	gathering 144:21	18:9,19 19:14,16	135:16 137:8,22
205:6	function 129:5	<b>gauge</b> 118:11	35:6 38:21 54:20	138:7 142:1,8,12
foundational 27:20	functions 16:18	<b>gears</b> 66:14	56:7 60:13 61:9	142:17 143:18
156:13 157:6	<b>fund</b> 16:1 145:10	general 48:18	80:13,16 92:9	146:9 147:11
221:11	fundamental 32:9	53:12 153:9,13	96:3 101:1,22	154:11 155:16
four 45:1 77:5	32:9 232:18 233:7	225:1 227:21	105:19 118:22	156:17 157:10,22
114:16 190:9	<b>funded</b> 114:17	228:14 258:14	127:4 131:21	159:4 160:14
199:21 216:8,15	246:19	259:11	134:20 138:4	161:17 162:1,10
236:15	funding 14:12	generalization	142:8 159:5	164:12 165:6,8,9
<b>fourth</b> 49:17 72:18	15:16,17 17:16	168:2,5,10	164:12 169:3	165:13,14,15,18
100:14 110:6	63:2 78:8 112:11	generalized 104:3	212:20 214:16	166:21 168:10
131:10 178:22	114:6 143:20	generally 18:11	238:18 264:1,3	170:9,15,16
260:19	145:22 204:18	103:1 129:14	<b>goal</b> 108:5 142:19	175:18 177:21
four-to-twelve	223:11 253:22	160:13 261:11	155:2,6 167:21	184:6 192:13
217:19	254:16	generating 80:6	178:7 215:6	193:15 194:13,18
fraction 203:21	<b>funds</b> 14:3 15:9	98:3	228:11 230:1	195:2 196:8
fragmentation	16:14,15 17:20	Geographic 97:22	232:4 240:16	198:17 199:11
36:11	144:18 145:6,19	Georgetown 4:19	goals 19:16 31:6	200:5 205:3,12,16
framework 43:13	146:21 182:19,21	120:16	148:11 177:13	206:20 207:22
47:6,10 117:6	203:12 213:9	getting 34:2 53:14	193:13 196:12	209:1,2,15 212:6
155:7 171:22	234:4,6 253:14	84:9 96:1 98:22 126:20 187:13	202:5 234:9 242:7	212:11 214:11
179:1 205:8,17	256:20,21 257:4,8	120.20 187.13	242:8	218:13 221:22

222.10.220.21	1 220-12	00.11.112.5	:1-1: 120:10	h d - 52.6
222:19 228:21	graders 220:13	99:11 113:5	guidelines 120:19	heads 53:6
229:4,4 230:21	grades 16:21,22	133:10 140:9	181:17 184:13	health 66:2 67:19
231:1,14 243:15	37:20 146:5,5	197:1 198:3,13	guys 120:10	87:14 108:1
264:17 267:11	219:18,19	209:11 223:17	H	120:17 240:14
good 8:3 25:1 29:6	grade-level 177:8	237:8,13,21 238:2	half 265:17	healthcare 108:7
38:22 39:20 54:2	grade-12 143:4	247:17	Hall 23:10	214:7 240:19
66:11 70:5 72:8	graduate 2:14 4:8	greatest 183:10	Hallahan 150:20	healthy 108:6
74:16 77:18 80:14	22:6 64:16 139:14	greatly 183:19	hand 230:18	240:17
82:7,8 83:22,22	228:13 232:17	Greenberg 4:12	Handbooks 44:3	hear 8:12 11:11,16
84:1 87:6 89:3	graduated 152:21	102:5,6	handle 40:4	12:2 13:16 48:18
98:12 107:19	Graham 50:21	grounded 205:18	handout 13:4 21:11	78:19 102:21
113:10 121:14	Grand 237:19	group 2:2,2 3:3,4	142:10	137:10,21 147:1
129:1,3,19,21	grandmothers	3:11,12 4:21,22	handouts 8:14	150:2 216:2 239:12
135:4 137:3 140:3	125:11	5:5,6,14,15 8:16	130:20	
140:4 154:6 163:9	grandparent 126:3	21:1 30:14 43:4,7	happen 100:4	heard 79:11 85:10
175:2 182:9	grandparents 125:22	67:12,16 68:9	204:9 226:12	86:5 131:6 192:12 193:20 208:8
188:10 192:4	- '	69:5,13 97:8 108:16 129:15	235:22	
198:10 215:9	grant 1:4 12:4,19		happening 163:17	238:21 239:4
236:2 240:8,11	12:22 14:3 18:14	132:21 133:9	163:21 195:8	265:5
252:13 258:1 262:4 268:11	19:3 26:8 31:17	137:13 220:12,18	happens 38:12 60:6	<b>hearing</b> 12:14 20:7 140:12 141:20
	37:16 65:5,6	241:9 244:5,6 245:15	134:6 229:12	
goodness 41:11	113:6 114:17		235:20 240:8	hearings 141:2
gotcha 122:11	118:1 119:4,12	groups 38:20 67:22	happy 9:2 120:8	heart 41:8,18 126:1
gotten 18:8	120:7 131:2	68:1 125:13	139:22 154:7	192:13
governed 253:2	133:21 140:14	133:15 207:10	Harcourt 4:17	Heat 224:3
government 65:13	145:7 151:15	214:21 242:9	118:18	held 118:6 123:6
121:14 247:7	205:6 207:1,5	grow 108:6 240:17	hard 97:18	236:6
grade 3:16 13:20	232:7 234:2	<b>growing</b> 64:20 68:9 70:12 71:7 106:8	harder 91:2	Hello 120:14
15:3 46:13 49:17 49:19 67:15 68:7	235:19 246:14		Harris 2:4 5:9,21	help 9:2 12:8 36:18
	258:9,11 259:3,5 260:1 262:14	<b>growth</b> 70:9 71:6 80:14	138:7,9,17,20	41:2 51:19 108:5
69:16 71:1,3,21 72:18,22 73:5	granted 205:5		139:1 140:2	108:9 110:20,21 138:3 148:12,21
86:22 89:2 99:14	granted 205.5 grantees 25:15	guarantee 46:22	147:12,13 192:12	156:17,19 159:15
	234:9 242:21	guarantees 162:7 guess 47:15 192:10	199:5 209:9	163:4 166:1 167:4
100:14,20 103:6 109:11 111:16	grants 18:2 65:21	225:9	215:15 220:5	167:10 168:8
114:9,18,22	119:7 131:12	guest 209:14	224:16 230:14	181:5 186:3
114:9,18,22	143:20 144:3,3,17	224:17	Harvard 2:15 4:8	188:17,20 189:6
131:10 143:6	145.20 144.5,5,17	guests 19:2 147:18	22:5 23:20 64:16	190:18 196:14
144:14 145:14	242:19 261:14	guffawed 57:9	Haskins 4:15	216:18 217:7
151:17 156:8,8	graphics 237:13	guidance 20:15	113:12 114:3	226:6 227:5 232:6
172:8,20 173:7	Gratale 6:17	33:12 120:6 149:3	hate 44:11	232:16 233:2
178:20,21 193:14	240:11,12	178:17 190:15	<b>Haven</b> 113:13	234:8 238:12,13
193:14 210:21	grateful 258:6	242:13	HCPS 152:18	240:17 251:14
215:20,22 223:5	gravitate 250:2	guide 33:4,8 43:22	Head 69:15 72:6	253:5 255:22
224:6 225:3,8	great 13:15 31:4	47:16 82:4 194:7	212:17 224:2	260:11 264:16
232:3 240:3	34:9 66:5 74:22	233:1	255:8	helped 187:2 202:5
254:13 260:19	77:17,21 93:1	guided 194:5	headed 28:12	265:19 267:16
25 1.15 200.17	11.11,41,73.1	Saluca 177.3		203.17 207.10
	l	l	l	I

h almfrel 21.7 27.1		140.20 150.14	IES-funded 75:10	      20.12
<b>helpful</b> 21:7 37:1 74:18 75:4 98:11	<b>high-quality</b> 19:22 51:19 64:4 76:18	148:20 158:14		implied 29:12
		230:1 252:6	<b>ignore</b> 50:19 56:17	<b>implying</b> 94:1
209:20	109:18 110:1	hopefully 18:14	96:4	importance 27:7
helping 21:2	113:19 148:14,16	156:22 165:11	ignored 51:21	87:21 99:16
126:21 183:20	179:4 182:17	192:15	<b>ignoring</b> 183:16	180:12 182:3
188:14 198:15	188:12 193:2	hoping 208:5	images 237:21	239:10 263:5
240:20 262:20	high-stakes 122:12	horror 92:16	imagine 9:8 57:6	265:7
helps 39:2 93:4	High-Tech 251:19	hospital 77:19	57:10	<b>important</b> 12:2,6,7
227:10 238:19	Hillsborough 2:20	Houghton 4:17	immediately 168:4	12:16 19:19 20:6
hesitate 138:4	6:10 152:17 153:1	118:18	immersed 76:18	25:3,4,15 27:11
Hewlett 66:4	198:1 199:14	hour 39:18 93:17	immigrant 67:11	27:22 28:22 29:13
<b>Hi</b> 102:5	205:4 209:4	hours 75:11 232:22	67:17 87:16	31:2,7,19 32:1
hierarchy 170:17	229:14 230:11	248:16 250:12	129:10	33:11 36:8 39:21
170:18,21	hinder 163:7	260:5,7,8	immigrants 69:14	46:9 49:7 50:3
<b>high</b> 17:1,4 25:6	hire 122:21	house 26:20 129:12	<b>impact</b> 32:11 76:4	51:16 53:22 54:14
26:10 48:6 72:4	Hispanic 10:13	houses 246:17	76:6 78:12 127:1	55:4 56:4 58:1
73:20 82:22 94:20	Hispanics 260:17	How's 11:14	161:17 184:1	60:12,19 77:6
98:15,15 103:12	historical 254:14	<b>hub</b> 233:12	254:22 255:18	103:19 110:20
103:18 115:19	historically 85:21	<b>human</b> 2:13 4:6	262:16	112:3 113:7 127:1
132:13 134:15	132:1	22:4 64:14 66:3	imperative 94:1	134:3 141:22
146:7 158:10	history 10:7	67:19 87:14	255:1 257:6	143:11 145:17
159:13 172:14	hit 27:2 78:9		implement 52:19	148:19 169:13
181:16 214:4	219:14	I	58:20 112:18	179:19 181:18
216:9 219:15	<b>hold</b> 70:7 117:13	idea 53:15 82:20	167:15 171:11	186:1,3 203:11
220:8,13,21 221:1	134:21 146:11	84:20 121:4 123:2	172:3 173:20	224:7 236:1 237:4
221:9,19 222:2	<b>holding</b> 15:12 21:3	164:20 165:2	181:5 182:19	237:15 238:10
223:11 224:9	169:16	ideal 56:6	183:5 188:18	239:19 240:6
229:4 251:19	<b>holds</b> 139:18	ideally 88:8 110:11	190:10 206:20	245:18 265:10,15
higher 152:14	home 49:14 77:18	ideas 12:15 27:8	223:12 243:16	267:6,8
180:17,22 225:15	125:12 126:16	55:16 81:18 82:3	248:4 253:5 256:8	importantly 89:20
260:6	156:7 214:14	83:18 84:15 86:8	256:16	238:4
highest 10:5 65:12	235:13 238:20	141:21 224:5	implementation	impression 133:14
68:21	266:13,21	identification	33:9 62:2 77:15	impressive 127:13
highlights 27:2	homes 127:16,17	69:21 113:3	117:15 151:12	<b>improve</b> 28:10 51:1
45:4 175:12	130:11 163:21	163:13	181:18 185:18	62:22 177:21
<b>highly</b> 110:9	214:11 260:10	identified 120:11	205:19 233:9	187:1,5 248:4
157:19 228:7	home-based 129:9	151:6 174:6,9	243:17 256:9	251:3,15 258:15
highly-certified	129:9	241:10 244:8	implementations	improved 115:14
120:1	honor 65:12 140:10	identifies 238:2	62:16,17	improvement 9:16
highly-engaging	honored 154:8	identify 174:1	implemented 33:7	152:6 182:7,14
250:21	honoring 46:11	183:22 244:2	59:4 87:3 242:10	184:22,22 189:10
highly-mobile	honors 10:12	identifying 112:11	244:11	202:20,22
92:12	hope 18:3,11 20:8	121:18 178:17	implementing	improvements
highly-qualified	24:20 96:16	218:18	176:11 218:7	175:21 181:14
228:9	104:18 120:18	IEL 246:17 251:16	243:20	255:9
high-frequency	123:6 144:20	<b>IES</b> 59:7 106:15	implications 65:19	improving 16:6
170:1	145:2 147:9	114:17 262:15	68:10	43:20 113:7
170.1	173.2 171.7		00.10	13.20 113.7
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

145:16 151:15	increasingly 174:3	128:11 129:18	institutions 128:14	110:2 117:12
175:12,14 178:5	incredibly 93:16	136:7,18 142:11	180:17,22 225:15	169:2 187:19,21
179:6 207:19	independence 45:7	144:21 149:19	248:9	188:13,15 190:16
216:22 234:17	254:14	191:12 227:3,5	instructing 106:21	193:3,5 195:19
247:15	independent 65:14	239:18 243:3	instruction 2:20	198:5,11,21 200:9
incentivize 185:6	167:9 233:16	informative 96:11	3:15 6:9 16:3,7	204:7,16 206:16
incidental 76:17	248:17	informed 106:14	25:20 26:2 29:4	206:17 208:5,10
incidentally 84:6	independently	195:18 241:18	31:6 35:1 38:13	instructionally
85:20	38:19 167:22	informing 90:2	38:18 40:6 44:21	206:19
include 24:9 25:5	<b>index</b> 10:6	<b>informs</b> 89:19	47:17 50:4,5 55:2	instructions 149:19
32:22 90:11	<b>India</b> 259:16	infrastructure 59:2	58:10 79:9 80:12	instructive 96:11
115:16 119:5	indicated 196:18	194:16 195:13	80:21 81:15,17	instructor 152:11
178:13 180:8,16	199:6	196:19,22 197:3	82:6,11 83:5	instrument 105:3,4
189:16 220:11	indicator 86:20	inherent 67:7	84:11 88:15 89:20	integral 31:12
232:9 233:21	individual 110:19	initiative 105:17	100:18 103:9,14	205:15
234:12 243:7,12	178:9 214:20	107:10,11,15	103:19 105:21	integrally 113:21
245:4 259:5	215:12 233:15	117:11,19 118:12	106:11,19 110:16	integrate 177:14
265:13	individualize	192:15 202:12	110:21 113:17	178:1
<b>included</b> 44:2 56:9	233:18	220:7,19 225:13	114:1,22 117:2,15	integrated 117:5
59:19 120:7 132:5	individualized	229:17	117:16 131:4	208:11 211:6
156:6 206:2	174:10	initiatives 35:14	133:2 134:14	intensity 77:10
includes 26:12	individuals 113:4	114:4 118:10	138:19 145:12,16	78:3,18 88:14
170:1 175:13	219:6 246:8	innovation 112:13	151:3 152:17	intensive 103:19
179:2 180:10	inductees 230:12	innovative 112:19	155:3,19 156:3	113:5 172:21
211:7,8	induction 54:4	186:8	157:9,22 158:16	173:3,19 174:3
including 10:12	229:18,22	<b>input</b> 1:7 12:3 18:7	159:11 162:6	183:9,18 241:9
12:11 65:22 116:6	ineffective 85:22	18:8 19:17 20:5	163:10,19 164:5	244:7
131:17 139:6	inefficient 85:21	20:22 75:16 100:6	165:21 166:13	<b>intent</b> 47:22
141:17 150:18	inexpensive 130:14	113:2 140:13,17	168:7,15 173:21	intentional 179:16
151:13 179:9	infancy 267:2	141:2,21 142:16	174:2,3,5,9 178:6	intentions 240:9
208:10 242:9	<b>infant</b> 236:4	148:1,2,18 149:10	178:9,13,20,22	interact 251:11
248:16 255:13	inferential 132:17	218:12 240:16	179:5,17 180:3	interaction 214:14
265:8	influence 121:14	246:2	182:17 193:16,20	interconnected
inclusion 110:22	121:17 159:1	<b>inputs</b> 76:4 217:17	194:3,7,18 197:16	176:6
128:18	influences 155:5,9	217:19	204:20 206:16	interdependence
income 132:1	156:15 159:19,21	inquiry 91:18	207:20 219:16	27:21
incorporate 64:6	159:22 160:8,17	insensitive 131:15	233:10 241:9	<b>interest</b> 110:13,15
244:21 251:13	162:11 169:6,10	insight 12:15	244:5,7 245:15	113:6 161:20
increase 20:1 80:3	<b>inform</b> 30:12	insights 101:6	248:5 249:15	162:9
83:9 214:13 225:7	110:20 181:14	227:4	250:16 251:7	interested 63:13
255:18	186:4,11 217:7	<b>insist</b> 60:21	252:10 254:1	interesting 38:4
increased 88:13	226:22	inspire 121:17	266:16	212:1 214:19
148:15	informal 41:4	instill 111:8	instructional 39:7	<b>Interestingly</b> 26:18
increases 10:6	89:22 166:9	Institute 6:19	50:8 56:10 58:12	interests 249:20
increasing 12:11	information 13:9	21:22 44:1 47:15	65:18 78:22 79:6	250:1 255:18
64:18 79:22	74:13 77:18 80:17	65:22 66:2 246:5	86:13 96:22 97:5	intermediate 152:5
141:17	87:18 89:11 117:4	institutional 61:3	97:7 109:9,16	218:11

intermetional 7:17	22.12.21	Inagualina 2.0	90.10.02.14.17	129,10 122,10
international 7:17	22:12,21	Jacqueline 2:8	80:10 92:14,17	128:19 132:19
23:9 32:4 47:9	introduction 5:4	153:22	126:13	135:18 144:7
262:6	24:20	James 150:21	keeping 20:22 90:3	166:10 177:17
internet 56:18,19	introductions 3:6	<b>January</b> 18:4	94:15 149:11	207:2,14 210:10
57:2	44:11	138:13 172:22	163:17 167:20	216:9 225:5
interplay 27:21	invest 111:17	173:4	170:18	kindergarten 49:16
193:7	123:12	<b>Jeff</b> 6:13 231:18	Kennedy 66:1	68:5 111:2,13
interpretation	invested 108:8	Jennifer 4:13	key 13:13 16:12	172:11,20 211:18
46:17	121:20 264:20	107:20	26:6 27:8 33:3	211:20 234:18
intersect 28:4	investing 111:21	<b>Jersey</b> 2:18 3:25	35:2 39:15 45:15	241:20,20
intersection 26:1	121:8 243:10	22:2 23:6 24:14	99:18,21 104:6	kindergartners
intervene 76:13	investment 39:20	43:2	143:1 145:5	108:14 241:5
160:20 163:11	invitation 66:12	<b>Jill</b> 2:17 6:6 151:8	171:21 175:13	kinds 32:10,21 57:5
164:4 165:14,20	<b>invite</b> 121:16	<b>job</b> 60:15 99:8	177:3 178:6 179:5	58:1,10 63:7,9
170:13 171:7	174:20	182:9 188:10	179:9,17 181:9	72:8 76:4 78:1
222:6	invited 23:19	204:7 208:3	194:21 197:8	84:20 91:12,18
intervening 171:17	<b>inviting</b> 18:3 19:21	209:11 225:12	199:21 200:15	93:2 95:19 96:12
220:3	118:21 147:4	249:22 250:20	201:5 216:3,7	98:1 127:8 132:18
intervention 16:5	154:9 175:4 192:9	<b>jobs</b> 53:17 99:5	241:6 257:14	238:5
25:16 43:21 75:21	234:13	job-embedded	<b>kid</b> 94:18 134:2	<b>King</b> 238:15
79:10 98:2 103:20	<b>involved</b> 29:1 30:8	180:1	<b>kids</b> 36:17 38:7	knew 115:5
113:5 115:18	37:13 40:11 91:12	<b>join</b> 28:15	40:14 53:16 59:13	knife 97:4
162:16 163:6,14	104:11 113:22	<b>joining</b> 123:22	75:21 79:13 83:12	know 11:22 15:17
164:1,10,21 165:3	184:2	140:8 152:1	88:4,11 90:18,22	17:6,13 19:10
165:17 166:2	involvement 25:21	<b>joint</b> 109:1	92:17 98:16	26:12 30:2 32:3
170:14 171:4	26:3	<b>joke</b> 48:13	104:21 127:9	32:18 33:16 37:21
172:1,4 179:1,5	involves 193:6	<b>Jones</b> 2:8 153:22	131:17 133:4,5,12	39:14 40:8,13,15
198:14 215:3,14	204:14 223:8	209:16,18 224:19	133:18 135:7	51:15 56:22 59:21
218:19,22 221:16	in-class 188:17	<b>July</b> 9:8	154:17,22 156:2,9	60:17 63:2 66:21
224:9 226:5	in-home 214:11	<b>justice</b> 248:18	158:18 159:7	67:3 77:2 79:2,15
241:12,16 244:13	in-service 219:7	juvenile 248:17	160:1,4,11,19	81:6,10 86:19
interventional	IRA's 23:12		161:15,20 164:5	89:15 94:17,20
128:6	isolated 129:14	K	168:3,5 174:5	101:14 102:22
interventionist	issue 48:11 56:5	<b>K</b> 16:21 100:10	205:9 218:17,18	107:2,16 109:22
184:19	63:2,20 98:4	121:2 146:5	219:8,20 220:14	111:11,15,20,21
interventionists	119:16 134:3	211:17 216:8,15	220:18 221:6,11	115:1,9,9 116:5
184:14	145:1 161:9	227:17	221:18 222:7	119:15 125:16,21
interventions 60:1	188:11 202:11	<b>Kamil</b> 2:12 4:3	228:15	126:21 127:9
63:22 112:7 116:9	issues 30:7 47:5	21:17 42:8,9,17	kind 13:22 26:13	133:20 134:2
145:14 189:19	55:4 67:1 88:5	44:10 92:8 93:20	28:19 32:15 34:11	137:5 140:9,11
198:14 219:5,18	136:1,5 160:13	95:14,17 99:21	41:3 53:4 54:1,3	141:6 149:12
222:3	220:2 247:1	127:4 134:4	54:17 57:9 58:13	153:20 154:21
<b>introduce</b> 8:20 9:4	items 115:6 185:22	177:16 188:8	59:1,20 61:17	155:15 156:15,16
24:16 64:12 138:7	186:2	<b>Kamil's</b> 79:17	63:14 66:14 82:14	157:10,12,21
149:22		Kargman 64:14	94:3 99:17 100:16	159:9 160:7,11
introduced 199:6	J	Kauffman 150:21	100:21 104:12	162:12 163:9,10
introducing 22:11	<b>Jack</b> 258:5	<b>keep</b> 34:11 54:11	116:13 127:10	165:1 168:4 169:9
			1	

170:12 171:20,21	ladder 170:21	246:5	142:2	179:20,21 180:5
176:13 180:18			learn 27:17 40:2	180:13 187:15
	171:8,14 206:16 220:1	<b>lasting</b> 112:14 127:1		
186:2 193:5,15 196:22 212:13	Landesman 4:18	late 20:20 86:22	41:14,17 52:16 64:18 71:16 79:22	189:17,20 190:22
215:2 216:4		87:10 89:13		191:1,3,8 193:8
	120:14,15 130:22		80:4 102:13	194:9 202:2 208:8
219:10 220:8,15	language 10:4 11:3	111:15	103:20 112:10	210:9 212:4 217:3
224:22 226:9	14:9 15:4 16:8,10	latest 24:8 57:1	117:8 157:9,14,16	219:12 233:12
252:1 266:22	16:11 17:10 23:5	150:18	157:16 172:17	238:9 253:6
<b>knowing</b> 216:19 262:22	23:15 27:16,18,18 27:19 28:2 39:10	<b>Latina</b> 10:12 <b>Latino</b> 69:14	219:11,13,17,22 220:15 221:10	254:14 259:9 260:11
knowledge 29:16	43:10 55:11 65:2	Laughter 11:15	245:6 260:18	LEAs 15:21 17:14
29:18 39:9 45:16	65:8 70:6 71:8	23:5 24:22 42:1	266:8 267:2	26:3 33:21 90:7
		44:14 93:19		
52:14,19 70:16	73:10,15,21,22		learned 112:4	90:11 120:4 146:1
73:3 74:15 75:1,2	75:8,13,19 76:1	101:11 125:18	122:1 123:15	146:17 252:6
80:10,20 81:4,13	76:15,18 78:6,16	224:21 229:9	157:13 166:4	256:1,10 257:6,10
98:5 106:10	81:19 83:7,18	laundromats	167:17 168:14,18	leave 174:5 220:18
115:13 116:10,14	84:4,10,13 85:6	237:18	176:20 212:5	227:20 228:8,12
157:5 158:8,12,16	85:18 86:9,16	<b>Laura</b> 6:23 258:2	learner 95:6	leaves 61:4 159:6
158:18,20 159:2,2	87:19 88:17,19,20	law 145:18	150:19 267:3,4	leaving 73:5,7
171:15 172:2	103:11 111:14	layered 203:7	learners 3:17 5:19	<b>Lecture</b> 23:20
177:22 219:9	116:7 120:9	<b>LEA</b> 5:18 146:13	10:4 12:12 15:4	led 256:3
251:6 253:15	125:12,20 126:15	181:7 241:21	29:14,15 55:12	left 59:12 256:12
knowledge-based	130:2,13 131:5	242:2 252:22	65:8 66:15 70:7	<b>Legend</b> 139:10
80:12,21 88:14	133:8 142:14	254:8	73:15 85:19 88:6	legislation 120:22
known 51:2 152:19	144:15 145:8	lead 151:11 208:16	97:15 99:2 110:1	lengthy 17:11,17
knows 39:6 126:15	155:14,15 158:5	211:12	133:8 141:18	<b>Lennard</b> 153:17
Kratz 6:13 231:17	169:11,18 214:9	leader 2:2 3:3,11	144:15 175:9,22	lens 177:9
231:18	214:14 233:5	4:21 5:5,14 10:15	189:14 190:3,5,19	Lesaux 2:13 4:5
<b>K-three</b> 217:18,18	263:22	117:12 198:21	210:5,15 242:1	22:3 64:13,22
K-to-12 10:15	languages 67:8	200:9 204:8	244:15 245:2,4,17	65:4 66:6,11
265:12	237:16 238:2	leaders 12:20 13:17	246:16 253:19	97:11 127:22
<b>K-12</b> 217:1,1 218:3	language/arts	128:8,9 185:5,7,9	learning 2:8 9:14	132:7 134:19
218:3 220:7 223:1	102:9	185:20 186:14		Lesaux's 116:8
223:7 227:10	language/early	247:18 258:8	23:8 24:10 27:8	lesson 105:7,10
254:15	156:6	leadership 6:19	53:8 69:4 71:14	180:2
<b>K-2</b> 114:9	lap 238:8	16:17 24:9 33:20	72:10 76:17 80:5	lessons 104:11
	large 14:2 15:19	34:21 35:5 86:14	82:11 89:5 91:3	105:8 112:4
	34:8 58:6 59:6,8	139:4,6,13 145:20	100:21 102:8	177:13
LA 10:19	67:11 103:5 135:3	153:6,17 176:9,16	107:15 109:21	letter 157:5 171:15
<b>Labor</b> 26:20	143:16 152:10	176:17 177:2,4	128:20 143:8	<b>letters</b> 34:9 87:7
Laboratories 4:15	216:14 259:15	195:6 200:3,11,15	146:16 150:7,21	169:19
63:5 113:12 114:3	larger 76:11 81:1,3	200:17,20,20	151:1,6 154:2	letter/word 69:21
Laboratory 43:18	144:18	246:6 248:22	160:4,12,15	<b>let's</b> 19:16 60:9
52:4	largest 67:15 68:8	250:3 253:15	163:13 166:20	99:9 160:5 196:16
<b>Labor's</b> 246:20	152:20 199:7,8	257:9 263:12	172:9 173:11,15	210:6 230:17
lack 251:5	231:21	leading 151:18	174:19 176:15	level 26:3 28:18
lacks 78:3	<b>Larson</b> 6:19 246:4	leads 64:17 112:13	178:14,14 179:16	29:7,8 33:2 34:20

35:7 60:2 73:10	life 27:9 204:13	16:2 17:22 20:10	232:2,3,15 233:1	248:3 252:18
90:3 92:9 93:12	lifelong 99:2	24:3,9,11 26:15	233:7,12 234:10	253:2 254:4 256:2
103:13 106:3,3	233:19	27:7,8,14,16,19	234:17 240:2,3	256:16 257:9
107:12 115:22	<b>light</b> 77:16 164:22	28:3 33:14 36:5	242:4 243:9 244:1	located 152:18
119:1 132:13	<b>lights</b> 165:1	37:4,21 42:15,22	246:14 247:15,22	262:7
134:21 145:15	light-touch 77:16	43:9,16,21 45:14	248:4,12 249:2,5	location 236:19
146:2 149:1	Likewise 233:6	45:15 48:2 50:15	249:13,14 250:16	locations 187:8
151:17 157:14	limited-English	65:2 77:12,22	251:7,13 252:2,10	266:21
160:16 178:20	55:7	78:5,17 80:12,21	253:1,15,18 254:3	long 24:20 37:5
181:7,7 200:14	limited-English	83:5,7 84:21 86:7	254:11,21 257:2	44:11 46:20 51:2
201:13,14 219:1	176:1 189:21	86:16 87:2,6	257:15 258:4,8,13	62:9 87:16 109:12
221:7,10,20	line 13:13 56:11	88:14 92:22	260:3 264:20	119:21
223:15 224:9	69:20 70:2 82:17	102:10 108:8	265:8,20 266:7,19	longer 85:13
225:11 247:21	99:8 101:12	109:13,15 110:8	267:9	longitudinal 74:5
260:18 264:14	linear 94:17 95:12	110:10 111:21	literacy-related	184:3 191:14
levels 9:17 20:12	lines 191:22	112:19 113:7,13	113:20	243:12
25:20 26:9 29:2,2	linguistic 29:17	114:1,2 115:14	literally 239:17	longstanding 232:4
32:8 86:21 111:3	64:19 67:6 68:12	122:15,18 127:14	literature 99:7	long-term 118:5
130:7 195:18	68:15,16	129:22 136:4	127:2	243:2
196:15 215:22	linguistically 76:22	137:17 140:15	little 15:22 17:11	look 12:14 20:6,11
218:8 223:3,5,16	linguistically-div	141:6,10,16 142:3	19:18 20:20 27:5	26:11 30:5 34:18
224:6	69:6	142:6,15,20,22	51:18 52:6 54:22	37:14 44:18 51:6
leverage 58:11	link 38:18 67:2	143:16 144:4,5,8	58:2 66:13,18	51:14 59:5 71:5
203:11	77:2 128:20	144:11 145:11	67:21 71:13 74:3	72:17 89:21 95:5
leveraging 74:22	163:21 170:10,12	146:14 147:1,6	87:21 89:13,18	95:20 103:9,11,14
256:19	214:15 218:20	148:22 150:8	90:1 94:10 97:14	104:7,12,16,19
levy 204:21	linkages 248:7	151:9,12,20 156:7	108:4 122:22	105:1,1,10,11,17
Librarian 6:15	linked 30:3 35:3	164:11 169:14	124:3 125:8 127:4	105:21,22 106:19
235:4,6	90:13 91:11 170:6	172:20 173:22	129:22 130:9	111:18 130:6
librarians 233:17	170:7 185:16	175:6,13,15,20,21	140:20 146:20	132:9 134:1
235:11	186:5 191:7	176:5,7,10,13,17	147:2 154:11	141:20 145:1
libraries 231:22	242:19	177:10,12,14	155:8 169:16	148:22 154:13
232:4,10,16,21	linking 33:21 34:21	178:6,19 179:6	183:7 192:14	160:5 164:19
233:2,6 234:1,14	219:3 221:13	181:6,19 182:1,4	194:13 198:17	192:15 193:4
235:9,15,19 236:3	links 31:14,15 32:1	184:13,17,21	210:4 213:14,21	195:1,7,16 199:11
236:7 237:15	35:20 37:3 181:2	185:15 186:2,5	215:2,7 216:2	201:18 202:13
238:12 239:8,15	<b>Lions</b> 261:5	187:2,4,16,18	219:1,2 227:7	205:9 206:5
239:15,17,21	lion's 201:11	188:2,6 189:20	239:10	207:18 208:2
240:4 265:8,11,15	<b>list</b> 46:11,20 50:6	194:14,19,21	live 112:10	210:4 212:15
266:2,10,17 267:5	93:9	196:12 202:13	<b>living</b> 139:10	218:9,10 222:10
<b>library</b> 6:14 7:20	<b>listen</b> 102:13 238:8	203:17,19 205:4,7	248:17	222:13,16 246:2
184:15 231:19,21	listening 83:1	205:14,16 209:2	<b>lo</b> 76:3	263:12 264:9
232:8,14 233:11	135:15 178:2	210:13 214:9	local 9:16 20:12	looked 35:15 48:12
233:17 235:1	<b>literacy</b> 1:4 2:17	217:9,11 220:9	32:2 35:7 106:3	72:8 87:6 130:7
236:10,12 237:7,8	5:13 6:6,23 11:3	223:13 224:11	111:2 121:9 136:1	207:5
238:15 239:6,17	12:10,20 13:18	225:8 226:2,3,7	149:1 152:5	<b>looking</b> 37:11 67:9
265:4,6,21	14:20,21,22 15:7	227:1 230:6,8	234:21 247:6,20	74:19 81:19 82:2
		•	,	
			1	1

	1		1	1
89:16 105:14	189:16 210:9,17	mandated 62:11	132:13 179:22	123:18 124:21
106:4 107:7,12	216:12 222:22	mandatory 121:1	185:8 187:10	125:2,4,15
123:13 191:18	227:6	<b>manner</b> 119:17	238:8	member 24:4,14
194:17 196:19	Louisiana's 151:14	254:1	meaning 155:2	42:10,14 43:3,5,6
197:3,10,11	151:19,22 175:12	<b>manual</b> 51:14	159:16 258:21	43:8,14 124:8
199:20 204:18	love 55:1 63:12	<b>map</b> 70:2	means 17:21 52:13	150:3
206:20 207:11,12	92:6 213:7 232:19	Margie 4:15	59:12 60:9 66:22	members 2:11 19:6
207:22 210:2,5	233:19 238:13	113:11	80:1 83:8 84:14	19:11 35:15 140:5
214:15 216:6	239:3	marginalized 132:1	86:4 95:11 117:11	150:1 189:4
217:15,16,20	loves 238:14	<b>Marie</b> 64:13	117:19 207:3	252:19 253:3
looks 40:12 72:7	low 131:13,22	<b>Martin</b> 238:15	237:5 240:21	memory 61:4
187:17 194:22	165:13,13 247:22	Massachusetts	260:10	160:13,14,18
198:18 210:12,13	248:12	87:12 128:7	measure 129:4	<b>Menlo</b> 262:7
218:15 229:15	lower 219:22	master 139:18,19	measures 118:11	mental 74:19
257:20	lower-class 127:17	mastered 168:22	166:9 208:14	mentally-handic
lose 162:9 224:15	lowest 170:16	mastery 116:14	measuring 88:5	153:3
loss 80:5	183:17	master's 150:13	mechanism 74:22	<b>mention</b> 259:21
<b>lost</b> 80:9	low-income 131:7	153:4	78:8 131:2	mentioned 23:3
lot 8:12 13:5 15:6	low-literacy 251:14	<b>match</b> 60:8,11 79:8	mechanisms 184:7	28:6 33:22 86:12
17:13 28:9 31:3	Lucy 6:21 252:14	79:20 96:22 106:5	media 30:19	105:14 125:22
31:18,18 37:20	lunch 10:3 124:12	matched 78:21	184:15 250:4	132:3 141:1
40:14 45:9 47:18	136:8,21 199:16	matches 57:11	medical 87:13	148:18 177:16
48:7,16 49:6	<b>Luther</b> 238:15	165:21	237:18	180:12 188:8
50:18 63:22 68:3		materials 104:15	meet 77:10 112:20	190:17 209:22
68:11 69:1,19	M	182:15,22 183:1	117:16 118:1	221:21 241:1
75:6,14 76:14,17	Magazine 10:13	188:13,15 197:10	190:19 200:8	mentioning 21:15
77:13 78:7,17,19	magnitude 76:10	208:6 220:4	204:5 207:22	mentor 251:11
83:13 85:10 86:2	264:14	233:16 262:1	219:20 226:22	mentored 116:17
87:11,12,15 92:13	mainstream 245:6	266:12 268:5	228:15 237:4	Mentoring 251:18
92:16 93:1,21	maintain 21:2	<b>math</b> 103:16	245:19 253:18	mentors 114:10
96:2 97:9,15	maintaining 165:4	<b>matter</b> 47:13	<b>meeting</b> 1:7,18	<b>Mercer</b> 150:22
99:13,15 126:1	maintains 193:8	101:18 136:20	3:17 5:18 13:1	message 27:12,13
129:1,15 132:17	<b>major</b> 59:5,15	182:7 194:21	19:17,20 20:8,13	181:19,21 237:21
133:11 137:18	63:15 100:5 228:2	231:11 268:14	20:18 102:4 141:5	met 22:11 52:22
144:1 159:9,11	<b>making</b> 41:19 48:1	matters 97:19	144:21 148:11,12	153:20 164:6
167:1 208:8,8	49:20 56:5 59:15	239:12	148:20 149:2,6	metacognitive
212:5 214:20	59:17 157:5	<b>Max</b> 64:13	178:6 189:13	160:21 161:10
215:21 220:20	163:21 165:7	maximize 20:21	190:2,7 203:4	methods 16:6
229:16	202:17 203:5	149:8 254:22	219:7 241:22	145:15
lots 36:19 51:8	219:4 221:8	256:15	244:15,19 245:16	method-proof
63:11 85:16 127:9	225:11	maximum 202:4	246:15	117:9
158:15 236:13	manage 8:16	MDRC 262:15	meetings 140:17	<b>Metro</b> 236:14
lottery 135:4	management 9:18	Meadows 6:23	<b>Melendez</b> 2:6 3:7	<b>Michael</b> 2:9,12 4:3
<b>Louisiana</b> 2:17 6:7	116:2 151:13	258:1,2	3:19 9:5,12,21	4:17 21:17 22:12
42:21 151:9	Manager 240:13	mean 36:8 76:20	11:1,9 18:17,18	79:16 86:11 94:16
175:16 179:2	managers 178:18	77:11 94:18,19	42:4 89:8 93:13	95:16 118:17
183:8 185:2	managing 86:15	105:18 122:14	99:11 101:3	177:16
	•	-	•	•

Michaella 120.0		04:040 240.12	120.9 246.6 17	170.11 171.6 11
Michael's 130:9	modeled 104:13	motivate 249:12	139:8 246:6,17	170:11 171:6,11
Micki 7:19 265:1	<b>modeling</b> 70:3	motivated 267:2,3	247:11,21 252:15	171:16,19,20
<b>microphone</b> 11:12	167:1,3	motivation 161:20	252:17 260:15	174:1 177:22
11:12 215:18	models 77:13,17	162:9 179:14	264:7	179:10 183:19,22
middle 17:1,4 48:5	104:8 114:11	move 25:9 48:10	nationally 150:6	187:4 194:6
49:18 72:1 73:8	moderate 48:6	82:16 83:4 84:2	nationally-focused	195:11 196:4
73:20 76:8 103:18	modification 60:4	84:12 92:13,14	247:9	197:10 200:12
115:19 127:16	modifications	94:19,20,21 103:1	national-level	202:3 207:22
146:7 153:8,10	59:16,18	134:20 135:4	247:7	218:20 219:17
216:9 219:15	modifying 60:10	155:18 162:7	National-Louis	220:12 222:4
222:2 223:10	<b>module</b> 206:15	167:2,9 170:17	23:16	225:10 230:16
Mid-Atlantic 52:4	modules 56:10	218:11 219:10	native 66:6 70:4,20	237:4 242:22
<b>Mifflin</b> 4:17 118:18	114:16	241:14 244:14	71:9 73:16 130:2	247:2 249:14
milestones 87:19	<b>Mom</b> 238:19	moves 97:20	natural 130:12	252:2 259:3,13
<b>million</b> 203:20	moment 215:14	moving 49:14,15	nature 83:16	264:18 266:8
253:13,21 264:19	moments 209:12	49:16 92:17	near 236:14	needed 28:1 56:1,2
mind 77:7 85:13	<b>Monday</b> 238:22	103:11	<b>nearly</b> 138:16	92:5 174:16 217:8
88:6 124:14,19	money 14:18 31:16	<b>multi</b> 190:19	necessarily 81:5	226:5,11 244:13
126:19 128:2	31:18,20 34:12,14	multiple 107:7	130:17 159:11	259:10
167:21 170:19	62:4 144:1	110:17 155:4	168:10	needs 3:17 5:18
215:6	<b>monies</b> 264:3	160:8 167:5 169:5	necessary 228:15	31:8 36:14 38:6
mindless 90:17	<b>monitor</b> 33:9 60:14	169:9 172:3	necessitates 248:1	39:7 41:13 44:19
<b>Mindy</b> 6:19 246:4	161:11 178:18	247:19 248:16	need 8:22 15:2,3	47:1 50:2 54:12
mine 52:3	195:7 243:17	252:11 264:15	28:5 32:14 33:18	59:1,2,19 61:13
minimum 118:2	monitoring 41:4	multi-sector	35:2,6 36:9,17	61:19 77:11 80:19
minority 43:10	117:15 189:8	111:19 112:6	40:4 41:7 45:11	84:16,16 90:10
65:2 73:15 90:20	198:8	mutual 109:9	46:18,19 48:11,16	92:9,19 93:11
minute 77:4 90:15	<b>month</b> 78:1		49:8 50:1,4,14,17	95:6,7 102:18
101:10 137:21	monthly 200:8	N	51:5,16 52:13,18	107:3 109:8
140:20	226:22	NAEP 46:13	53:1,2,8,9,14 54:1	112:20 121:12
minutes 18:22	months 210:22	name 8:15 102:5	54:11 56:9 57:4	126:4 127:21
24:21 76:10	212:7	107:20 125:16	57:13,17 58:14	132:21 136:3
101:17 142:13	morning 8:4,10,19	231:18 240:12	60:3,3,18 63:17	143:10 144:13
179:9 231:2,10	22:8 25:1,13	246:4 249:1 258:2	63:18,21 64:4,5,6	154:14,17 155:22
236:17,19	66:12 79:12 85:10	265:1	67:1 71:10 72:9	165:21 166:14
mismatch 71:18	107:19 108:17	named 10:18 65:4	79:7,16,20 80:1	171:4 175:8
mispronounce 23:4	113:10 116:8	naming 161:16	84:15 87:1 88:7	176:22 178:10,19
missing 58:18	135:15 137:6,9	narrow 187:2	92:13,20,21 93:8	183:10 189:13
mission 16:9	177:17 180:11	nation 9:17 24:5	93:10 96:7,9,20	190:3,5,7,19
258:12	188:8 190:18	152:20 239:18	111:17 112:5	191:8,10 193:16
mobility 102:22	192:7 202:10	252:19	121:9 126:9 127:5	194:8,10 197:4
model 74:19 76:4	203:13 208:18	national 6:22 21:22	127:7 132:17	199:3 200:22
81:16 85:15,20	213:8 215:20	23:14 24:1,3 32:1	135:6 136:13,18	201:2,15,19 204:5
114:13 162:19	222:9 241:2	32:5 43:5,8,11	138:2,5 144:12	208:2 212:4 215:4
166:16 214:8	morning's 8:20	47:5 51:20 65:1	145:7 159:14	219:7,20 228:15
243:21 257:17	11:8	66:2 69:20 70:2	163:2 165:10	233:3 242:1
266:14	mothers 77:17	70:10 71:7 97:21	167:14 168:1,6	244:15,20 245:1,3

245.0.16.10	177 17 051 10	177.2	P 56 20 110 2	120 10 200 12
245:9,16,19	177:17 251:12	occurs 177:3	online 56:20 110:3	128:10 200:12
246:15 247:3	non-reader 222:13	offer 124:6	135:15 149:21	231:8
253:18 256:16	norm 69:21 70:10	offered 135:14	189:11 197:21	ordinary 130:13
264:16	71:7	250:7	onset 177:1	<b>Oregon</b> 43:1
negative 59:10	norms 19:17 70:3	offering 250:17	open 19:8 90:8	organization 246:7
122:12	North 138:22	offers 195:20	147:22 231:15	organizational
neglected 49:1	139:17	229:21	232:21	29:7 35:21
neighborhood	notch 94:19,21	office 2:2,5,6,9 3:4	opened 236:11	organizations
129:11	note 68:20	3:8,12,20 4:22 5:6	opening 3:2 137:8	31:16 32:2,6,10
neighborhoods	notes 39:12	5:10,15,23 8:18	258:16	32:12 33:22 35:8
133:5 257:13	notice 18:3 19:21	9:7 13:8 22:13	operates 107:22	35:9 65:22 180:9
Nemours 4:14 6:18	20:16 29:10	102:8 125:20	<b>opinion</b> 54:17	246:8 247:8,9,10
107:21 108:5,10	136:17 147:3	137:14 138:11	opinions 100:15	248:9 249:4,8
112:5,22 240:13	148:12,17 149:4	142:3 246:20	132:4	250:10 258:9
240:17 241:2,16	164:2 169:16	263:19	opportunities	259:22 262:19
241:17 245:8	234:12	offices 262:8	61:21 64:18 79:22	264:12
246:1	<b>notion</b> 37:2 66:18	officials 267:15	80:4 83:10 84:1	organizations/ag
network 63:4 198:9	80:11	Oh 125:1,4	87:17 88:18 162:5	234:15
Neuman 44:6	November 1:13	oil 165:9,12,12,14	164:8 167:5	organize 38:11
never 8:6 224:19	26:19	166:11	168:16,17 172:17	206:16
new 2:18 3:25 13:6	Novice 53:22	okay 11:17 19:16	180:6 190:22	organized 25:22
14:21 22:2 23:6	NSBA 253:12	21:11 22:10,20	221:9 239:19	organizing 176:11
24:14 26:14,16	257:20	58:13 60:13 61:9	247:1 250:3 255:4	oriented 129:19
30:1 35:14,14	NSBA's 254:7	72:1 93:13,14	257:5	ought 26:7 47:20
36:22 37:9 42:18	<b>nuance</b> 210:18	94:5 95:16 101:3	opportunity 19:11	54:3,5,7,8 63:8
43:2 47:5,10	nuanced 28:20	101:21 156:10	20:13 22:19 80:9	68:13 69:10 71:12
56:12 61:4 113:12	number 9:19 10:11	173:1 187:11	83:19 102:12	72:14 85:15
137:11,11 168:22	19:10 54:19 56:21	209:9 215:15	105:19 107:14	134:18
210:18 230:2,5,12	101:14 193:18	224:16	113:2 118:22	outcome 96:19
230:12 232:22	235:20 259:16	older 84:22 171:9	121:17 124:7	106:6 107:1
253:5	262:19 263:18	171:16	125:8 131:1 148:4	outcomes 52:7,21
newcomer 84:11	numbers 30:14	<b>oldest</b> 231:20	148:7 149:2,9	78:17 109:13
newcomers 68:1	39:3 260:7	once 18:7 29:5	195:21 208:20	132:10 176:15
news 163:9 215:9	numerous 139:3	53:16 78:1 95:17	224:20 229:11	177:22 262:16
NEWSOME-JO	151:4 193:18	103:20 107:9	235:15 236:22	outlined 33:4
101:21 231:14	0	149:8 155:18	240:7,10,15 246:2	outlines 199:22
<b>NIA</b> 18:7,9		156:3,20 157:7,12	254:11,20 257:16	output 100:5
nice 40:7 230:15	<b>objections</b> 260:20	175:17 186:17	257:19 258:17	218:10
nine 153:3	objects 127:14,15	187:8,15 189:9	260:14	outputs 217:16,18
nine-month-old	observational	191:13,14,22	opposite 64:3	outreach 189:6
238:22	167:19	219:14 222:1	optimize 255:4	outside 8:14 19:14
ninth 49:19 100:20	observations 166:9	ones 32:3 50:14	options 110:4	101:15 180:7
Nonie 2:13 4:5 22:3	246:12	81:1 239:10	136:8	250:9,19 251:2
64:13 94:22	<b>observed</b> 266:3	ongoing 31:10	oral 27:16,17,18,19	Outstanding 10:15
nonprofit 234:15	<b>obviously</b> 70:18	41:18 152:4 197:4	76:15 86:8 88:17	10:19 23:12,15,17
246:7	occasionally 261:7	225:6 227:2	88:18 169:10	out-of-school
non-academic	occur 216:21	257:21	order 3:2 108:8	248:15 251:21

overall 34:16 132:9	238:10 245:13	116:7 144:14	<b>percent</b> 10:4 16:16	<b>phonics</b> 82:8,21
242:18	parental 245:21	194:18 216:6	16:20,21,22 67:10	157:8 158:4
· -	parents 28:4	220:6	76:1 93:4,5 111:5	
overlaps 227:12 overlook 45:13	125:10,10,13	partner 10:16	111:12 115:6	<b>phonological</b> 151:2 160:14 179:11
	, ,	120:3 252:7		<b>Ph.D</b> 11:1 150:14
overlooked 258:14	126:13,22 127:6		121:2,2,3 145:20	172:15
oversight 181:17 254:16	128:4,22 129:20	partnering 232:9 233:22	145:22 146:4,4,5	
	172:13 173:11	:	199:15 213:9	pick 84:6 227:18
overview 5:13	180:11,14 189:3	partners 267:8	233:15 260:9,17	<b>picture</b> 20:9 187:13
25:10 33:11 142:5	214:12,12 232:22	partnership 127:11	264:1,2,5	201:6
overwhelmingly	233:3,4 236:21	262:18	percentage 121:11	piece 57:13,13,22
197:19	245:19 266:12,15	partnerships 87:13	percentages 146:3	60:12 100:5
overwhelms 31:5	266:18 Parts 262:7	111:19 112:1,7,12	percentile 72:1,2	143:14 144:17,18
owe 21:9	Park 262:7	146:17 248:7	73:7,8	145:5 169:11
o'clock 53:7	parks 248:21	264:11	perfect 105:11	179:7 180:9,15
P	part 16:12 21:16	parts 13:13	117:7	203:10,14,17
Pacific 43:18	25:17 28:14 29:18	passage 74:9,15	perfectly 234:5	205:20 206:18
pad 91:21	31:7,12 32:15	passed 119:8	<b>perform</b> 115:3	217:3,17,18,19,20
pad 91:21 page 67:5 80:15	34:16 35:4,9 36:9	pasting 57:2	<b>performance</b> 106:5	218:20 221:12
90:22 177:20	51:11 57:12 89:15	pathologists 184:15	118:11 132:16	piecemeal 215:8
Paige 2:15 6:4	104:22 126:7	pathway 156:13	183:22 184:10	pieces 83:5 127:13
150:3,4	128:18 130:16	pattern 72:21	performing 203:4	157:10 158:6,13
· /	145:17 175:5	95:20 107:8	period 231:2	159:4 162:20
pain 213:15 263:21	179:15,17 182:18	127:11	<b>Perkins</b> 204:19	216:13,19
paint 20:9 148:21	194:15 196:20	patterns 97:7	permission 245:13	pilot 215:10 223:6
198:19	200:10 201:9	102:20 103:4	persists 27:9 70:22	223:8
painted 201:6	205:15,22 212:21	Pause 140:22	person 192:13	pipeline 185:4
paired 177:4	212:21 229:13,21	pay 63:18 91:2	personal 54:17	<b>PISA</b> 42:13 47:9
panel 2:11 3:14	234:1,12 237:2,13	122:22 135:6	personnel 30:7	place 33:17 34:10
5:18 8:21 11:20	238:10 239:19	PBS 261:15	204:11	35:22 36:13 59:5
19:5 21:16 24:3	250:8 259:6,17	PCP 1:18	perspective 136:1	70:4 135:12
42:18 43:6,9,17	participants	<b>PD</b> 114:4 115:16	192:14 208:21	157:11 158:1,13
43:20 51:20 65:2	235:19	118:8,14	210:5 212:10	162:20 163:18
124:16,19 125:7	participate 60:22	pedagogical 118:15	213:22 218:2	171:4,18 181:13
125:16 133:11	192:9 249:17	pediatrician 261:1	perspectives 216:1	204:17 205:1
135:11 137:11	participates 61:10	peer 18:13 79:19	253:16	212:20 213:1,2
147:2,17,20 150:1	participating	peers 71:9 111:14	perspective-taking	217:2,13 220:4
150:3 175:5 192:9	241:13 251:4	pendulum 81:7	132:18	221:17 222:7,10
panelists 3:22 4:2	participation	<b>people</b> 13:15 27:13	pertinent 19:3	223:7 226:16
6:2 19:1 22:7,8,17	239:21 259:12	28:5,7,15,17 30:6	pervasive 112:8	232:14,18
89:10 124:13	265:14	34:4 36:2 37:19	<b>phase</b> 109:4	<b>placed</b> 191:15
209:10,14,19	particular 49:1	40:8,20 41:2 49:3	philosophical 45:4	places 26:1 72:3
224:17 230:17	59:7,22 66:15	57:8 61:17 85:18	<b>phone</b> 21:6 149:15	128:9 237:17
267:14	67:22 98:4 121:12	95:9 98:20 124:17	phonemic 156:16	plan 26:12 29:7
panels 24:4	133:21 207:21	130:10 247:1,16	156:17 157:4	30:15 38:22 42:22
parallel 30:3	223:15	252:2 268:9	158:3 169:15,17	59:3,17 84:2
parent 126:7	particularly 45:14	<b>people's</b> 100:15	169:20 171:3,14	88:20 92:7 94:10
127:11 172:14,15	60:1 75:4 77:6,11	perceive 125:9	171:15 220:2	109:5 121:5 132:5

104 17 444 0 44	1 00 5 440 40	(4.01.66.17.67.10		1
134:17 144:8,11	play 92:5 112:10	64:21 66:15 67:10	pragmatic 134:4	presented 117:4
151:20 163:2	125:10,13 127:14	72:6 77:7 85:13	<b>pre</b> 241:19	presenters 154:4
164:9 175:14,20	130:11 160:10	92:13 132:9 204:6	predict 96:18	presenting 21:9
176:7,17,19	233:6 249:5	265:14	predictive 110:9	presently 119:14
177:12 178:11,16	256:18 265:12	populations 29:9	predictor 89:3	preserving 256:2
179:4,7,15,17,21	played 185:13	55:13,14 77:1	predominantly	President 23:9
180:15,18 181:3,6	player 51:15 267:6	132:2 207:13	72:13	113:13
181:12,15 182:8,8	plays 89:17 151:10	208:2	preface 141:5	Presidential 65:11
185:17,19 186:6	Plaza 1:19 237:20	position 118:21	prejudge 95:22	<b>presiding</b> 1:22 8:3
188:1,6 190:3,4,7	please 21:6,12 42:8	positioned 253:5	96:18	press 71:1 95:8
190:10,11 194:14	101:14 102:2	positive 176:15	<b>premiere</b> 107:22	pressing 67:1
195:9 196:13	123:16 136:10	266:4,5,14 267:1	240:14	pretty 48:6 72:8
197:12 199:1,10	257:21 267:7	possess 172:2	preparation 181:1	118:13 142:18
199:21 200:4,7	pleased 9:4 11:5,6	possibilities 208:22	225:5,16,20,22	210:17
201:9,18 202:6,8	11:7 252:21	possible 57:18	226:16 227:10	prevent 65:18
202:9,16,18,22	pleasure 24:16	223:20 243:11,19	248:20	163:12 221:17
203:6,15,17,19	140:9 149:22	255:16	<b>prepare</b> 49:11	Preventing 24:6
204:2,4,5,12,13	192:7	possibly 102:19	180:19 182:16	prevention 25:16
205:1 209:1	plenty 237:3	posted 97:22 268:3	183:2 219:19	25:17 115:17
216:14,15,19	<b>plug</b> 206:6	post-secondary	prepared 48:12	162:17 163:16,18
217:1,2,4,7,22	plug-and-play	248:9	221:2 226:1,7	163:19 164:10,21
218:3,5 221:14,17	206:3	potential 98:20	228:4	165:3,17 172:1,4
223:12,22 226:21	podcasts 98:3	113:7	preparing 44:6	221:16 222:22
231:4 248:3 254:3	point 62:7 73:19	Potomac 1:19	219:11	248:18
<b>planful</b> 38:14,16	89:14 98:14 116:8	poverty 68:22	preregistered	preventional 208:4
98:6	134:1,11 171:5	214:4	101:13	preventions 171:12
	010 00 010 15	0.1407.4		1 -
planfully 97:14	210:20 213:15	<b>powerful</b> 197:1	preregistering	previously 191:20
planned 38:17	219:10 221:6,18	258:17	preregistering 237:1	<b>previously</b> 191:20 245:13
<b>planned</b> 38:17 83:15 124:3	219:10 221:6,18 239:14	258:17 <b>PowerPoints</b> 14:8	preregistering 237:1 preschool 24:10	previously 191:20 245:13 pre-determine
planned 38:17 83:15 124:3 planning 43:11	219:10 221:6,18 239:14 <b>points</b> 20:17 25:20	258:17 PowerPoints 14:8 practice 37:19 38:1	preregistering 237:1 preschool 24:10 156:10 157:3	previously 191:20 245:13 pre-determine 120:22
<b>planned</b> 38:17 83:15 124:3 <b>planning</b> 43:11 94:9,11 144:3	219:10 221:6,18 239:14 <b>points</b> 20:17 25:20 28:7 101:2 103:3	258:17 <b>PowerPoints</b> 14:8 <b>practice</b> 37:19 38:1 43:22 47:16 48:1	preregistering 237:1 preschool 24:10 156:10 157:3 210:21 211:14	previously 191:20 245:13 pre-determine 120:22 pre-K 16:21 49:15
planned 38:17 83:15 124:3 planning 43:11 94:9,11 144:3 235:20	219:10 221:6,18 239:14 <b>points</b> 20:17 25:20 28:7 101:2 103:3 104:12 120:18	258:17 <b>PowerPoints</b> 14:8 <b>practice</b> 37:19 38:1 43:22 47:16 48:1 90:17 104:21	preregistering 237:1 preschool 24:10 156:10 157:3 210:21 211:14 214:16 236:5	previously 191:20 245:13 pre-determine 120:22 pre-K 16:21 49:15 49:15 87:10
planned 38:17 83:15 124:3 planning 43:11 94:9,11 144:3 235:20 plans 15:1,2,7	219:10 221:6,18 239:14 <b>points</b> 20:17 25:20 28:7 101:2 103:3 104:12 120:18 149:5 216:7,11	258:17 <b>PowerPoints</b> 14:8 <b>practice</b> 37:19 38:1 43:22 47:16 48:1 90:17 104:21 107:1 114:6	preregistering 237:1 preschool 24:10 156:10 157:3 210:21 211:14 214:16 236:5 242:9 253:7	previously 191:20 245:13 pre-determine 120:22 pre-K 16:21 49:15 49:15 87:10 103:11 115:16
planned 38:17 83:15 124:3 planning 43:11 94:9,11 144:3 235:20 plans 15:1,2,7 17:22 30:17 33:5	219:10 221:6,18 239:14 <b>points</b> 20:17 25:20 28:7 101:2 103:3 104:12 120:18 149:5 216:7,11 235:8	258:17 <b>PowerPoints</b> 14:8 <b>practice</b> 37:19 38:1 43:22 47:16 48:1 90:17 104:21 107:1 114:6 118:14 145:16	preregistering 237:1 preschool 24:10 156:10 157:3 210:21 211:14 214:16 236:5 242:9 253:7 265:18	previously 191:20 245:13 pre-determine 120:22 pre-K 16:21 49:15 49:15 87:10 103:11 115:16 146:4 193:14
planned 38:17 83:15 124:3 planning 43:11 94:9,11 144:3 235:20 plans 15:1,2,7 17:22 30:17 33:5 49:22 60:10 79:3	219:10 221:6,18 239:14 points 20:17 25:20 28:7 101:2 103:3 104:12 120:18 149:5 216:7,11 235:8 policies 67:2 68:2	258:17 <b>PowerPoints</b> 14:8 <b>practice</b> 37:19 38:1 43:22 47:16 48:1 90:17 104:21 107:1 114:6 118:14 145:16 164:16 165:22	preregistering 237:1 preschool 24:10 156:10 157:3 210:21 211:14 214:16 236:5 242:9 253:7 265:18 preschools 68:5	previously 191:20 245:13 pre-determine 120:22 pre-K 16:21 49:15 49:15 87:10 103:11 115:16 146:4 193:14 211:22 212:14
planned 38:17 83:15 124:3 planning 43:11 94:9,11 144:3 235:20 plans 15:1,2,7 17:22 30:17 33:5 49:22 60:10 79:3 80:2 81:20 85:15	219:10 221:6,18 239:14 points 20:17 25:20 28:7 101:2 103:3 104:12 120:18 149:5 216:7,11 235:8 policies 67:2 68:2 176:4 184:1	258:17 <b>PowerPoints</b> 14:8 <b>practice</b> 37:19 38:1 43:22 47:16 48:1 90:17 104:21 107:1 114:6 118:14 145:16 164:16 165:22 167:7,9,12 168:16	preregistering 237:1 preschool 24:10 156:10 157:3 210:21 211:14 214:16 236:5 242:9 253:7 265:18 preschools 68:5 prescribed 196:5	previously 191:20 245:13 pre-determine 120:22 pre-K 16:21 49:15 49:15 87:10 103:11 115:16 146:4 193:14 211:22 212:14 216:8,15 241:8
planned 38:17 83:15 124:3 planning 43:11 94:9,11 144:3 235:20 plans 15:1,2,7 17:22 30:17 33:5 49:22 60:10 79:3 80:2 81:20 85:15 128:16,18 143:16	219:10 221:6,18 239:14 points 20:17 25:20 28:7 101:2 103:3 104:12 120:18 149:5 216:7,11 235:8 policies 67:2 68:2 176:4 184:1 246:10	258:17 PowerPoints 14:8 practice 37:19 38:1 43:22 47:16 48:1 90:17 104:21 107:1 114:6 118:14 145:16 164:16 165:22 167:7,9,12 168:16 259:1	preregistering 237:1 preschool 24:10 156:10 157:3 210:21 211:14 214:16 236:5 242:9 253:7 265:18 preschools 68:5 prescribed 196:5 201:11	previously 191:20 245:13 pre-determine 120:22 pre-K 16:21 49:15 49:15 87:10 103:11 115:16 146:4 193:14 211:22 212:14 216:8,15 241:8 pre-kindergarten
planned 38:17 83:15 124:3 planning 43:11 94:9,11 144:3 235:20 plans 15:1,2,7 17:22 30:17 33:5 49:22 60:10 79:3 80:2 81:20 85:15 128:16,18 143:16 144:12 147:1	219:10 221:6,18 239:14 points 20:17 25:20 28:7 101:2 103:3 104:12 120:18 149:5 216:7,11 235:8 policies 67:2 68:2 176:4 184:1 246:10 policy 2:4 5:10,22	258:17  PowerPoints 14:8  practice 37:19 38:1  43:22 47:16 48:1  90:17 104:21  107:1 114:6  118:14 145:16  164:16 165:22  167:7,9,12 168:16  259:1  practices 43:22	preregistering 237:1 preschool 24:10 156:10 157:3 210:21 211:14 214:16 236:5 242:9 253:7 265:18 preschools 68:5 prescribed 196:5 201:11 prescriptive 121:11	previously 191:20 245:13 pre-determine 120:22 pre-K 16:21 49:15 49:15 87:10 103:11 115:16 146:4 193:14 211:22 212:14 216:8,15 241:8 pre-kindergarten 111:1
planned 38:17 83:15 124:3 planning 43:11 94:9,11 144:3 235:20 plans 15:1,2,7 17:22 30:17 33:5 49:22 60:10 79:3 80:2 81:20 85:15 128:16,18 143:16 144:12 147:1 175:6 176:11	219:10 221:6,18 239:14 points 20:17 25:20 28:7 101:2 103:3 104:12 120:18 149:5 216:7,11 235:8 policies 67:2 68:2 176:4 184:1 246:10 policy 2:4 5:10,22 9:12 28:6 47:4	258:17  PowerPoints 14:8  practice 37:19 38:1  43:22 47:16 48:1  90:17 104:21  107:1 114:6  118:14 145:16  164:16 165:22  167:7,9,12 168:16  259:1  practices 43:22  68:3 88:2 106:14	preregistering 237:1 preschool 24:10 156:10 157:3 210:21 211:14 214:16 236:5 242:9 253:7 265:18 preschools 68:5 prescribed 196:5 201:11 prescriptive 121:11 present 2:1,11	previously 191:20 245:13 pre-determine 120:22 pre-K 16:21 49:15 49:15 87:10 103:11 115:16 146:4 193:14 211:22 212:14 216:8,15 241:8 pre-kindergarten 111:1 pre-kindergartn
planned 38:17 83:15 124:3 planning 43:11 94:9,11 144:3 235:20 plans 15:1,2,7 17:22 30:17 33:5 49:22 60:10 79:3 80:2 81:20 85:15 128:16,18 143:16 144:12 147:1 175:6 176:11 180:2 193:22	219:10 221:6,18 239:14 points 20:17 25:20 28:7 101:2 103:3 104:12 120:18 149:5 216:7,11 235:8 policies 67:2 68:2 176:4 184:1 246:10 policy 2:4 5:10,22 9:12 28:6 47:4 68:9 138:10	258:17  PowerPoints 14:8  practice 37:19 38:1  43:22 47:16 48:1  90:17 104:21  107:1 114:6  118:14 145:16  164:16 165:22  167:7,9,12 168:16  259:1  practices 43:22  68:3 88:2 106:14  109:16 176:5	preregistering 237:1 preschool 24:10 156:10 157:3 210:21 211:14 214:16 236:5 242:9 253:7 265:18 preschools 68:5 prescribed 196:5 201:11 prescriptive 121:11 present 2:1,11 199:2 260:9	previously 191:20 245:13 pre-determine 120:22 pre-K 16:21 49:15 49:15 87:10 103:11 115:16 146:4 193:14 211:22 212:14 216:8,15 241:8 pre-kindergarten 111:1 pre-kindergartn 108:13 241:4
planned 38:17 83:15 124:3 planning 43:11 94:9,11 144:3 235:20 plans 15:1,2,7 17:22 30:17 33:5 49:22 60:10 79:3 80:2 81:20 85:15 128:16,18 143:16 144:12 147:1 175:6 176:11 180:2 193:22 200:13 201:5	219:10 221:6,18 239:14 points 20:17 25:20 28:7 101:2 103:3 104:12 120:18 149:5 216:7,11 235:8 policies 67:2 68:2 176:4 184:1 246:10 policy 2:4 5:10,22 9:12 28:6 47:4 68:9 138:10 246:21 262:6	258:17  PowerPoints 14:8  practice 37:19 38:1  43:22 47:16 48:1  90:17 104:21  107:1 114:6  118:14 145:16  164:16 165:22  167:7,9,12 168:16  259:1  practices 43:22  68:3 88:2 106:14  109:16 176:5  178:12 223:13	preregistering 237:1 preschool 24:10 156:10 157:3 210:21 211:14 214:16 236:5 242:9 253:7 265:18 preschools 68:5 prescribed 196:5 201:11 prescriptive 121:11 present 2:1,11 199:2 260:9 presentation 79:17	previously 191:20 245:13 pre-determine 120:22 pre-K 16:21 49:15 49:15 87:10 103:11 115:16 146:4 193:14 211:22 212:14 216:8,15 241:8 pre-kindergarten 111:1 pre-kindergartn 108:13 241:4 pre-reading 244:2
planned 38:17 83:15 124:3 planning 43:11 94:9,11 144:3 235:20 plans 15:1,2,7 17:22 30:17 33:5 49:22 60:10 79:3 80:2 81:20 85:15 128:16,18 143:16 144:12 147:1 175:6 176:11 180:2 193:22 200:13 201:5 202:19,20 203:5,9	219:10 221:6,18 239:14 points 20:17 25:20 28:7 101:2 103:3 104:12 120:18 149:5 216:7,11 235:8 policies 67:2 68:2 176:4 184:1 246:10 policy 2:4 5:10,22 9:12 28:6 47:4 68:9 138:10 246:21 262:6 policymakers	258:17  PowerPoints 14:8  practice 37:19 38:1  43:22 47:16 48:1  90:17 104:21  107:1 114:6  118:14 145:16  164:16 165:22  167:7,9,12 168:16  259:1  practices 43:22  68:3 88:2 106:14  109:16 176:5  178:12 223:13  practicing 92:2	preregistering 237:1 preschool 24:10 156:10 157:3 210:21 211:14 214:16 236:5 242:9 253:7 265:18 preschools 68:5 prescribed 196:5 201:11 prescriptive 121:11 present 2:1,11 199:2 260:9 presentation 79:17 147:18 149:18	previously 191:20 245:13 pre-determine 120:22 pre-K 16:21 49:15 49:15 87:10 103:11 115:16 146:4 193:14 211:22 212:14 216:8,15 241:8 pre-kindergarten 111:1 pre-kindergartn 108:13 241:4 pre-reading 244:2 priceless 260:14
planned 38:17 83:15 124:3 planning 43:11 94:9,11 144:3 235:20 plans 15:1,2,7 17:22 30:17 33:5 49:22 60:10 79:3 80:2 81:20 85:15 128:16,18 143:16 144:12 147:1 175:6 176:11 180:2 193:22 200:13 201:5 202:19,20 203:5,9 205:16 209:2	219:10 221:6,18 239:14 points 20:17 25:20 28:7 101:2 103:3 104:12 120:18 149:5 216:7,11 235:8 policies 67:2 68:2 176:4 184:1 246:10 policy 2:4 5:10,22 9:12 28:6 47:4 68:9 138:10 246:21 262:6 policymakers 65:20	258:17  PowerPoints 14:8  practice 37:19 38:1  43:22 47:16 48:1  90:17 104:21  107:1 114:6  118:14 145:16  164:16 165:22  167:7,9,12 168:16  259:1  practices 43:22  68:3 88:2 106:14  109:16 176:5  178:12 223:13  practicing 92:2  180:20	preregistering 237:1 preschool 24:10 156:10 157:3 210:21 211:14 214:16 236:5 242:9 253:7 265:18 preschools 68:5 prescribed 196:5 201:11 prescriptive 121:11 present 2:1,11 199:2 260:9 presentation 79:17 147:18 149:18 presentations 19:1	previously 191:20 245:13 pre-determine 120:22 pre-K 16:21 49:15 49:15 87:10 103:11 115:16 146:4 193:14 211:22 212:14 216:8,15 241:8 pre-kindergarten 111:1 pre-kindergartn 108:13 241:4 pre-reading 244:2 priceless 260:14 primarily 160:3
planned 38:17 83:15 124:3 planning 43:11 94:9,11 144:3 235:20 plans 15:1,2,7 17:22 30:17 33:5 49:22 60:10 79:3 80:2 81:20 85:15 128:16,18 143:16 144:12 147:1 175:6 176:11 180:2 193:22 200:13 201:5 202:19,20 203:5,9 205:16 209:2 234:11 242:11	219:10 221:6,18 239:14 points 20:17 25:20 28:7 101:2 103:3 104:12 120:18 149:5 216:7,11 235:8 policies 67:2 68:2 176:4 184:1 246:10 policy 2:4 5:10,22 9:12 28:6 47:4 68:9 138:10 246:21 262:6 policymakers 65:20 Pomona 9:22	258:17  PowerPoints 14:8  practice 37:19 38:1  43:22 47:16 48:1  90:17 104:21  107:1 114:6  118:14 145:16  164:16 165:22  167:7,9,12 168:16  259:1  practices 43:22  68:3 88:2 106:14  109:16 176:5  178:12 223:13  practicing 92:2  180:20  practitioners 65:20	preregistering 237:1 preschool 24:10 156:10 157:3 210:21 211:14 214:16 236:5 242:9 253:7 265:18 preschools 68:5 prescribed 196:5 201:11 prescriptive 121:11 present 2:1,11 199:2 260:9 presentation 79:17 147:18 149:18 presentations 19:1 19:4 22:16 54:19	previously 191:20 245:13 pre-determine 120:22 pre-K 16:21 49:15 49:15 87:10 103:11 115:16 146:4 193:14 211:22 212:14 216:8,15 241:8 pre-kindergarten 111:1 pre-kindergartn 108:13 241:4 pre-reading 244:2 priceless 260:14 primarily 160:3 210:20 211:11
planned 38:17 83:15 124:3 planning 43:11 94:9,11 144:3 235:20 plans 15:1,2,7 17:22 30:17 33:5 49:22 60:10 79:3 80:2 81:20 85:15 128:16,18 143:16 144:12 147:1 175:6 176:11 180:2 193:22 200:13 201:5 202:19,20 203:5,9 205:16 209:2 234:11 242:11 249:2 253:18	219:10 221:6,18 239:14 points 20:17 25:20 28:7 101:2 103:3 104:12 120:18 149:5 216:7,11 235:8 policies 67:2 68:2 176:4 184:1 246:10 policy 2:4 5:10,22 9:12 28:6 47:4 68:9 138:10 246:21 262:6 policymakers 65:20 Pomona 9:22 pooling 215:6	258:17  PowerPoints 14:8  practice 37:19 38:1  43:22 47:16 48:1  90:17 104:21  107:1 114:6  118:14 145:16  164:16 165:22  167:7,9,12 168:16  259:1  practices 43:22  68:3 88:2 106:14  109:16 176:5  178:12 223:13  practicing 92:2  180:20  practitioners 65:20  practitioner's	preregistering 237:1 preschool 24:10 156:10 157:3 210:21 211:14 214:16 236:5 242:9 253:7 265:18 preschools 68:5 prescribed 196:5 201:11 prescriptive 121:11 present 2:1,11 199:2 260:9 presentation 79:17 147:18 149:18 presentations 19:1 19:4 22:16 54:19 101:5 147:17,19	previously 191:20 245:13 pre-determine 120:22 pre-K 16:21 49:15 49:15 87:10 103:11 115:16 146:4 193:14 211:22 212:14 216:8,15 241:8 pre-kindergarten 111:1 pre-kindergartn 108:13 241:4 pre-reading 244:2 priceless 260:14 primarily 160:3 210:20 211:11 primary 89:2
planned 38:17 83:15 124:3 planning 43:11 94:9,11 144:3 235:20 plans 15:1,2,7 17:22 30:17 33:5 49:22 60:10 79:3 80:2 81:20 85:15 128:16,18 143:16 144:12 147:1 175:6 176:11 180:2 193:22 200:13 201:5 202:19,20 203:5,9 205:16 209:2 234:11 242:11 249:2 253:18 254:12 255:2	219:10 221:6,18 239:14 points 20:17 25:20 28:7 101:2 103:3 104:12 120:18 149:5 216:7,11 235:8 policies 67:2 68:2 176:4 184:1 246:10 policy 2:4 5:10,22 9:12 28:6 47:4 68:9 138:10 246:21 262:6 policymakers 65:20 Pomona 9:22 pooling 215:6 poor 90:20 133:4	258:17  PowerPoints 14:8  practice 37:19 38:1  43:22 47:16 48:1  90:17 104:21  107:1 114:6  118:14 145:16  164:16 165:22  167:7,9,12 168:16  259:1  practices 43:22  68:3 88:2 106:14  109:16 176:5  178:12 223:13  practicing 92:2  180:20  practitioners 65:20  practitioner's  192:11	preregistering 237:1 preschool 24:10 156:10 157:3 210:21 211:14 214:16 236:5 242:9 253:7 265:18 preschools 68:5 prescribed 196:5 201:11 prescriptive 121:11 present 2:1,11 199:2 260:9 presentation 79:17 147:18 149:18 presentations 19:1 19:4 22:16 54:19 101:5 147:17,19 192:20 208:9	previously 191:20 245:13 pre-determine 120:22 pre-K 16:21 49:15 49:15 87:10 103:11 115:16 146:4 193:14 211:22 212:14 216:8,15 241:8 pre-kindergarten 111:1 pre-kindergartn 108:13 241:4 pre-reading 244:2 priceless 260:14 primarily 160:3 210:20 211:11 primary 89:2 114:19 218:11
planned 38:17 83:15 124:3 planning 43:11 94:9,11 144:3 235:20 plans 15:1,2,7 17:22 30:17 33:5 49:22 60:10 79:3 80:2 81:20 85:15 128:16,18 143:16 144:12 147:1 175:6 176:11 180:2 193:22 200:13 201:5 202:19,20 203:5,9 205:16 209:2 234:11 242:11 249:2 253:18	219:10 221:6,18 239:14 points 20:17 25:20 28:7 101:2 103:3 104:12 120:18 149:5 216:7,11 235:8 policies 67:2 68:2 176:4 184:1 246:10 policy 2:4 5:10,22 9:12 28:6 47:4 68:9 138:10 246:21 262:6 policymakers 65:20 Pomona 9:22 pooling 215:6	258:17  PowerPoints 14:8  practice 37:19 38:1  43:22 47:16 48:1  90:17 104:21  107:1 114:6  118:14 145:16  164:16 165:22  167:7,9,12 168:16  259:1  practices 43:22  68:3 88:2 106:14  109:16 176:5  178:12 223:13  practicing 92:2  180:20  practitioners 65:20  practitioner's	preregistering 237:1 preschool 24:10 156:10 157:3 210:21 211:14 214:16 236:5 242:9 253:7 265:18 preschools 68:5 prescribed 196:5 201:11 prescriptive 121:11 present 2:1,11 199:2 260:9 presentation 79:17 147:18 149:18 presentations 19:1 19:4 22:16 54:19 101:5 147:17,19	previously 191:20 245:13 pre-determine 120:22 pre-K 16:21 49:15 49:15 87:10 103:11 115:16 146:4 193:14 211:22 212:14 216:8,15 241:8 pre-kindergarten 111:1 pre-kindergartn 108:13 241:4 pre-reading 244:2 priceless 260:14 primarily 160:3 210:20 211:11 primary 89:2
planned 38:17 83:15 124:3 planning 43:11 94:9,11 144:3 235:20 plans 15:1,2,7 17:22 30:17 33:5 49:22 60:10 79:3 80:2 81:20 85:15 128:16,18 143:16 144:12 147:1 175:6 176:11 180:2 193:22 200:13 201:5 202:19,20 203:5,9 205:16 209:2 234:11 242:11 249:2 253:18 254:12 255:2	219:10 221:6,18 239:14 points 20:17 25:20 28:7 101:2 103:3 104:12 120:18 149:5 216:7,11 235:8 policies 67:2 68:2 176:4 184:1 246:10 policy 2:4 5:10,22 9:12 28:6 47:4 68:9 138:10 246:21 262:6 policymakers 65:20 Pomona 9:22 pooling 215:6 poor 90:20 133:4	258:17  PowerPoints 14:8  practice 37:19 38:1  43:22 47:16 48:1  90:17 104:21  107:1 114:6  118:14 145:16  164:16 165:22  167:7,9,12 168:16  259:1  practices 43:22  68:3 88:2 106:14  109:16 176:5  178:12 223:13  practicing 92:2  180:20  practitioners 65:20  practitioner's  192:11	preregistering 237:1 preschool 24:10 156:10 157:3 210:21 211:14 214:16 236:5 242:9 253:7 265:18 preschools 68:5 prescribed 196:5 201:11 prescriptive 121:11 present 2:1,11 199:2 260:9 presentation 79:17 147:18 149:18 presentations 19:1 19:4 22:16 54:19 101:5 147:17,19 192:20 208:9	previously 191:20 245:13 pre-determine 120:22 pre-K 16:21 49:15 49:15 87:10 103:11 115:16 146:4 193:14 211:22 212:14 216:8,15 241:8 pre-kindergarten 111:1 pre-kindergartn 108:13 241:4 pre-reading 244:2 priceless 260:14 primarily 160:3 210:20 211:11 primary 89:2 114:19 218:11

nuincinal 61.45	nwo.ooggad 19.9	2.15 19 2.24 4.4 6	213:16 215:19	42.12 170.10
<b>principal</b> 61:4,5	processed 18:8	2:15,18 3:24 4:4,6		43:12 178:18
131:7 153:7,8	<b>processes</b> 74:12 161:11	6:4 21:18,21 22:4	223:6,8 228:4	189:8 198:8
200:16	_ :	22:22 23:1,2	229:19,22 232:2,7	260:16
principals 117:10	processing 57:7	24:17 42:5,7,9,17	237:11 240:2,16	progression 190:6
123:4	<b>Proctor</b> 23:2	44:9 64:11,13,14	241:3,6,18 242:12	progressions 190:9
principal's 11:13	<b>produce</b> 185:10	136:2 150:5	242:15 243:10	project 25:4 114:5
principled 56:20	<b>produced</b> 24:5 43:20 47:16	152:14 261:2	244:11 246:14	151:14 152:2,13
<b>principles</b> 37:18		professors 63:11	251:18,20 253:1,5	214:2,20 215:10
55:15 208:8	<b>producing</b> 100:9	93:20 208:18	253:11 254:19,22	229:14 264:14
<b>print</b> 24:10 55:19	productive 83:10	226:20	255:22 257:11,16	<b>projected</b> 67:9
98:10 155:2 157:4	93:17	proficiency 10:6	258:9,11 259:3,4	projects 91:18
159:16 169:12	products 205:21	244:3	259:6 264:21	121:21 250:4 Para 257 12
<b>printed</b> 237:15	206:9	proficient 55:8	267:11	<b>Promise</b> 257:12
258:19	professional 3:14	179:11	programmatic	promising 176:5
<b>prior</b> 9:20 138:14	16:3 31:10 32:2,6	<b>profile</b> 73:19	30:7	promote 135:8
148:2 152:1	35:22 36:1,4	profiles 73:14,15	programming	185:13 224:4
153:11 198:7	37:12 41:9,12,15	75:15 80:13	55:17	239:9 243:21
<b>priorities</b> 12:11	44:5 48:10,17	132:15	programs 6:21	247:12 265:20
109:10 141:17	51:17,19,22 52:9	profoundly 153:2	8:16 9:18 24:13	266:19
priority 117:20	52:12,15 53:3,10	<b>program</b> 1:4 5:13	30:1 35:14 36:14	promoting 168:2
193:9	53:12,22 54:1,8	12:16 13:6,11,14	40:14 56:11 58:5	promotion 153:9
<b>private</b> 107:21	54:17 55:2 60:17	13:18 14:1,10	59:9,16 62:8,20	233:10
146:18 173:6	60:20 61:18,20	15:8,10,16,18	62:21 63:18 64:1	<b>prompt</b> 206:5
privilege 11:19	62:10 64:4 86:5	16:13 20:5,10	67:2 69:2,15 77:8	<b>proper</b> 251:9
probably 15:11	88:3 90:2 103:22	25:15 26:5 29:22	77:22 80:7,8 86:7	properly 133:2
30:20 34:7 46:10	104:5,7,9,13	30:4 31:12 36:4	112:8,19 117:3	261:11
91:5,9 92:9 93:18	105:22 106:15	36:10,12 37:2	121:10 129:14	proposal 32:16
111:4 119:21	108:19,20 109:14	41:14,20 54:4	137:13 142:22	34:19 44:20 47:2
162:1 212:8,19	109:18,21 113:16	58:20 59:14 60:5	150:10 154:16	50:10 54:3 90:12
268:4	113:20,22 115:5	62:10 64:17 66:17	155:12,20 157:3,3	151:22
<b>problem</b> 35:13	116:13,22 119:20	67:14 75:21 98:21	164:11 181:1	proposals 20:1
52:7 71:10,15	120:6 121:22	99:14 111:6,9,20	191:2,3 204:10	26:8 32:20 33:1
74:14 81:1,3 92:7	126:10 127:5,12	113:2,6 117:7	207:18 222:17	33:10 35:4 39:13
164:2,3 248:1,12	139:4 145:12	122:15,18 127:21	223:2 225:16,21	39:16 50:2 58:15
proceedings 268:14	179:20,21,22	137:18 140:15,18	225:22 226:5,17	59:19 63:8 69:11
process 9:11 18:5	180:10,13 188:16	141:22 142:6,15	227:14,15 233:1	82:13 148:14
18:10,14 35:21	191:5,8 195:21	142:18,20,21	233:11 234:5	194:1
57:12 126:8,13	196:2 201:4,12,17	143:4,9,12,17	235:1 236:6 237:3	proposed 33:5
146:22 155:9	211:7 220:21	145:5 148:18,22	243:1 244:21	58:21
159:21 162:21	225:6 244:22	152:12 154:12,20	246:10 248:17,18	proposing 122:4
163:6,16 166:14	247:6 250:14,15	157:21 159:5	248:20,21,21,22	protecting 28:17
170:10 171:21	251:6 254:1	162:14 169:14	250:11 251:1,4,12	proven 120:2
188:19 193:10	255:17 256:22	173:22 174:11	251:17 252:8,15	234:16
205:8 207:19	professionals 65:14	177:2 181:10	257:12 260:3	provide 18:11,12
211:6,14 212:6	247:18 248:14	182:18 188:3	261:5,12,15 263:1	33:20 46:15 50:5
222:15 226:8,17	250:18 251:10	193:3,5 205:8	263:13,20 266:18	103:3 106:1,3
235:20 239:22	professor 2:12,13	207:21 210:13	progress 41:4	109:17 112:17

				I
113:2 116:12	19:12 20:4,15,22	<b>push</b> 74:3 82:19	74:9 89:14 93:18	239:17 255:19
120:8,9 134:13	65:8 101:13 102:4	86:8 129:22 210:3	124:17,22 125:3	reaching 249:9
148:1,18 156:1	113:6,16 123:9	pushing 85:5	138:1 149:4	252:8
158:14 162:5	124:2,6 135:14	128:16	154:21 174:21	read 14:13 17:9,18
164:4,7 165:20	138:15,22 140:12	<b>put</b> 18:9 21:7 34:8	215:16 224:18	32:8 40:2,15
166:12,16 167:5	140:13 146:17	34:10 88:8 108:22	254:8 263:16	44:17 46:8 50:22
173:18 174:2,6	148:1,2,6,7,17	149:16 203:18	264:17	53:16,19 55:21
182:22 183:11,15	149:3,10 152:10	205:1	quick 101:9 127:20	56:17 69:22 70:13
185:14 188:16	152:17 174:15	<b>puts</b> 197:15	149:14	73:1 94:10 95:11
190:4,14 195:4,9	202:11 211:20	<b>putting</b> 55:11 57:3	quickly 13:15	102:8 103:20
221:8 225:5 230:6	212:12 231:1,15	59:8 202:9	18:19 27:3 39:11	114:20 146:9
240:16 242:13	232:5,10,14,21	P-R-O-C-E-E-D	69:8,18 84:3,12	157:18 158:19
243:2,14 244:6	233:2,22 234:14	8:1	123:9 137:19	161:5 219:11,12
246:2 250:14,20	234:15 235:9	<b>P-12</b> 257:17	142:9 164:13	232:12 237:22
253:6 254:1 256:5	239:8 248:8 249:7	<b>p.m</b> 136:22 137:2	172:7	238:3,13,13 259:9
257:20 262:11,19	249:11 255:14	231:12,13 268:13	quite 8:7 28:16	260:11,18 266:9
263:2	258:14 259:11,13		261:16 264:15	267:3
<b>provided</b> 54:5 56:1	259:15 262:11	Q	<b>quo</b> 80:9	reader 45:18 55:22
56:2 152:4 163:14	264:19 265:3,8,14	qualified 228:8	<b>quoting</b> 173:12	79:17 161:8,8
168:14 172:21	265:21 266:2,10	<b>qualify</b> 199:15		170:4
173:2 186:19	266:17 267:5,19	qualities 34:18	<u>R</u>	<b>readers</b> 1:3 5:13
252:4,9 266:11	publications 24:8	206:13	Race 151:22	24:5 26:5 29:10
providers 15:21	44:2	<b>quality</b> 75:7,13,16	196:20 229:16	29:11,22 36:7,15
17:14 87:14	publicly-funded	78:5 87:22 114:17	racial 131:5	39:14 44:21 45:5
129:15 143:8	250:11	130:3 134:16	rainforest 74:17	45:6 46:5,14 47:1
146:1,16 242:17	public/private	135:1 176:16	raised 126:3	47:21 50:10 66:17
243:15 253:9	111:19 112:6	187:16 214:13	130:11	67:14 76:22 77:10
provides 96:10	<b>publish</b> 18:3 147:3	226:6 255:9,16	raising 254:6	79:2,6 80:13
104:8 106:12	published 151:4	quantity 214:14	Ramey 4:18 120:14	82:14 90:19 92:12
167:8 178:16	publisher 119:20	quarter 123:12	120:15 130:22	93:5 98:11 99:2
195:5 196:10	publishers 91:8	quasi-experimen	<b>RAND</b> 24:7 43:6	108:9 116:4
198:12 200:11	<b>Pullen</b> 2:15 6:4	62:12	range 12:9 141:15	131:14 134:6
201:7 206:15	150:4,4,9,17	question 27:20	241:14,20 246:22	137:17 140:14
258:17	154:5,6 179:8	55:5 74:2 84:20	ranges 143:5,11	142:5,14 151:14
providing 20:4	213:20 218:16	99:12 113:16	236:7	160:22 161:1
34:21 35:5 83:11	220:20 222:21	124:15,17,19	ranging 141:7	171:9,17 207:1,5
88:4 104:18 118:8	224:22 227:7	126:5 127:3	ranks 68:8	210:1 232:1 240:1
119:20 148:17	purchase 197:10	130:19 133:3	<b>rapid</b> 161:16	240:21 246:13
158:17 181:17	207:17	209:16 216:13	rarely 129:4 234:4	248:11,13 253:1
183:4 195:3	<b>purpose</b> 12:22 31:6	220:6 222:20	rate 68:21 71:8	253:11 254:19
214:11 265:19	45:20 140:11	224:20 254:10	rates 70:9,13 71:6	255:21 256:9,14
provision 17:15	161:4 189:4 240:9	255:21 256:18	80:14 113:8	256:21 257:11,15
provisions 234:13	purposeful 31:1	264:13	raw 147:6	262:13,17
psychology 66:7	93:22 104:3	questions 4:9 6:11	reach 32:8 78:9	readily 110:4
<b>public</b> 1:7 2:22	purposes 264:4	13:5,8,10 20:16	112:9 126:12	189:11
4:10 6:10,12 7:13	<b>pursue</b> 60:5 112:1	21:12 22:17,18	128:4 156:4	readiness 111:15
7:20 12:5,5 19:9	119:11	27:4 44:16,17	182:21 236:1	241:15 265:20
				-

			İ	İ
reading 2:2 3:4,12	200:13,18,20	96:8 98:6,10	150:7	148:8 231:5
4:22 5:6,15 8:16	201:9 202:5,8,18	99:20 100:12,15	recommend 190:14	registration 136:6
23:7,10,10,13	202:19 203:6,15	101:6 109:1	248:5 255:8	136:15 268:1
24:6,7,13 27:6	203:19 204:2	111:10,17,22	recommendations	regular 29:22 30:4
32:4,8,9 40:3,9,16	205:18 207:18,20	112:16 123:5,10	47:17 48:7 50:7	36:13 37:2 128:12
43:6,7,9,12,17	218:3 219:9,13,16	126:11 128:8	108:21 186:19,21	227:2
44:3 45:16,22	219:16,22 220:15	163:8 186:12,12	246:13 247:5	regularly 117:16
48:22 49:4 51:1	221:4,5,10 225:19	194:16 197:2	recommended	reinforce 110:13
51:11,20 52:1	228:5,20 229:1,1	201:22 204:21	122:6	110:15 258:21
57:19 58:3,5 59:7	229:2,3,20 230:7	207:2 216:3	recommends	reiterate 96:4
65:16,18 66:21	232:19,20 233:9	222:10,16 225:5,7	233:20	148:10
69:19 72:2 73:5	233:16,18,19,19	225:12 245:20	record 39:2 101:19	<b>related</b> 161:9,19
74:8 76:7 80:15	238:4 239:10	268:8	101:20 136:21,22	246:9
81:21 82:5,10,12	241:10,15 244:3	<b>realm</b> 267:6	148:9 231:5,12,13	relates 12:10 91:17
85:5 86:20 100:18	251:15 258:15	reason 38:4 83:17	234:16 268:2	141:16 246:15
102:9 103:14	259:1 262:16	250:13	recreation 248:21	relating 9:14
104:3 106:21	266:4,20 267:1	reasoned 74:12	250:3	244:22
111:3,8,14 113:4	reads 237:11	reasons 79:19	recruit 185:6 229:7	relationship 115:1
114:8,9,22 115:2	238:19	126:1	recruited 69:14	126:14 226:14
115:22 116:2,4	ready 232:12 237:3	reassess 168:12	72:5	relatively 203:21
117:11 127:19	251:18 256:7	reassessing 164:17	red 34:8	released 44:8
129:13 137:13	real 11:19 31:5	reauthorization	<b>reduced</b> 199:16	releasing 117:13
145:14 151:15,16	34:3 63:3 68:9	9:10 255:8	reduced-price 10:3	relentless 59:8
152:6,9 154:12,15	70:15 75:18 82:14	receive 12:2 15:15	refer 122:3	relevant 33:21 35:8
154:20,22 155:3,3	88:16 96:13 99:21	15:17 20:14 145:6	referenced 143:21	38:2 249:19
155:5,8,10,12,19	161:4 164:17	149:3	references 32:22	250:22
156:3,14,15,19,21	167:16,18 168:7	received 10:11	refers 162:21 163:6	reliable 178:18
157:1,19,20,21	192:7	23:12 136:8 139:5	<b>reflect</b> 28:11 194:8	reliance 106:13
158:22 159:5,6,8	realistic 51:6	139:11,16 143:22	247:5	rely 85:14 212:11
159:10,12,16,19	reality 68:13	149:17 150:11	reflected 50:2	remaining 253:21
159:20 160:6,8,11	realize 117:6	153:4 173:7	254:15	remarks 3:2 25:22
160:15,17 161:2,4	131:16 161:5	186:15 267:19	reflecting 201:20	134:15
161:12,17 162:11	182:21 234:9	receiving 76:5	reflects 12:4	remediate 163:3
162:14 163:4,10	reallocate 78:12	182:19 241:15	reform 151:21	164:8
163:15 164:17	really 11:5 20:6	receptive 129:18	182:5	remediation
165:17 167:16,18	25:14,18 30:11	recess 148:3	regarding 194:3	162:15,21 164:10
167:20 168:8	35:6 37:1,10,10	recipient 65:10	246:13 252:21	164:20 165:3
169:6,10 170:2,3	38:22 40:8 41:13	153:15	regardless 228:16	221:15 229:2
170:4,10,17	41:19 53:14 56:4	reclassified 68:6	230:8	reminder 21:5
171:20,22 172:1	57:17 58:1 60:21	88:22	<b>Regents</b> 226:20	149:15
172:10 173:20	66:16 67:6 68:17	recognition 34:15	region 214:3,5	renaming 122:16
176:21 178:1	69:8 70:11,12	116:6 169:22	215:2	repeat 57:15
184:18 188:8	73:21 78:3 80:18	recognitions 45:22	Regional 43:18	repeated 161:22
193:2,10,11,16,18	81:2,16 82:2,7,8	recognize 234:20	52:4 63:4 139:7	repeatedly 58:7
196:7 197:7,8,12	82:18,19 88:17	255:1 256:10	register 19:14	161:22 166:19
197:16 198:22	89:4,11 90:12	257:13 263:9	73:22	replace 165:10
199:10,21 200:7	92:6 94:1 95:5,17	recognized 10:14	registered 19:12,13	replicable 214:8
-,		0		
		I	I	1

			I	I
<b>report</b> 24:7 51:20	129:1 152:12	responsiveness	259:5	216:22
122:21 123:1	176:4,14,14	218:19,22	rigorously 104:19	sample 71:20 72:17
reporting 184:7	181:10,13,14	rest 28:15 55:1	risk 72:3 113:4	73:4 185:21
198:9	196:8 197:7,8	147:14	132:9,11 151:5	samples 39:4
reports 184:9	207:3,9 218:21	result 20:1 148:15	154:18 155:22	Samuel 23:1
191:12 260:16	232:11 257:1	195:19 206:9	160:1 172:6	<b>Santa</b> 2:6 3:7,19
represent 33:18	259:6,8,11 261:16	226:17	173:17,19 241:14	9:5 11:9 18:18
69:9 135:22	261:17,20 262:6	<b>results</b> 110:19	244:8 252:9	42:4 89:8 93:13
representation	263:14,19 266:3	185:10 186:16,16	road 123:15	99:11 101:3
175:11	researcher 54:15	186:18,21 243:12	robust 196:18	123:18 124:21
representing	researchers 65:20	259:10	role 9:9 89:17,22	125:4,15
252:18	76:12 114:7	retain 185:6 257:6	90:5,6 125:9,13	sat 54:18
represents 231:21	research-based	reteach 168:21	131:1 151:11	satisfied 30:15
request 119:2	54:16 63:17	reteaching 164:18	181:9 185:13	Saturday 238:18
122:2	106:14 117:1	165:5 169:4	233:7 249:3 256:2	238:21
require 51:8 62:4	145:15	return 86:3 93:6	256:19 265:11	saved 192:10
112:17 118:10	research-ground	reveals 30:17	roles 40:19 85:9,18	<b>saying</b> 94:16 111:4
130:10 239:20	116:15	review 18:13 33:5	86:14 181:4	141:6
242:5 261:16	resistance 28:14	52:5 59:20 176:4	roll 188:22 200:13	says 17:12 53:6
required 199:1	resource 121:18	181:10 211:20	205:16	60:7 91:2
200:4 203:1	197:13 259:1	257:3	<b>rolling</b> 197:11	Scaffolded 38:5
requirement	resources 34:4	reviewed 39:5	room 91:8 97:15	scalable 260:12
235:21	56:19 134:9	51:21 58:15	126:15 238:17	scale 58:7 59:9
requirements	179:20 180:6	225:20	rooms 237:18	78:13 183:17
119:4,6,8,13	182:16 183:1	reviewing 181:13	roughly 14:16	schedule 20:20
120:5 142:18	189:11 190:14	Revision 42:19	115:6	21:2 50:16 149:7
145:18 243:6	195:9,22 200:12	rhetoric 49:2	route 85:22 86:2	scheduling 49:18
256:11	203:12 204:8,13	<b>rich</b> 158:15 194:16	routine 53:3	<b>Schiller</b> 7:16 262:4
requires 19:22	204:22 215:7	richer 195:15	routinely 127:15	262:5
84:10 92:1 148:13	256:20	<b>riding</b> 98:18	<b>RtI</b> 117:6 174:3	Scholars 65:5
203:3 263:22	respect 29:16	<b>right</b> 9:10 25:6	179:1 198:14	<b>school</b> 2:14,16 4:8
<b>requiring</b> 48:19,20	respectful 130:21	27:3 28:10 34:10	262:16	6:5,22 9:22 10:9
235:18	<b>respond</b> 264:18	48:14 68:18 71:2	<b>rubric</b> 206:11	10:15 15:20 17:2
rescreen 244:10	responds 45:19	73:19 92:5,21	<b>run</b> 59:11 69:7	17:4 21:19 22:6
rescreening 241:11	response 20:15	94:6 99:7,10	77:22 137:8,13	25:6 26:3,10 29:7
244:9	91:14,16 149:4	101:1 133:17	rungs 170:22	35:15 42:10 49:18
research 16:5	198:13	146:22 165:10	running 68:18	64:16 72:1,4 73:8
21:21 22:1 32:18	responses 83:11	171:17 184:12	89:12	73:20 76:8 82:22
32:21 42:18 43:9	254:7	188:19 220:3	runs 37:16 135:17	87:17 88:15 92:15
44:3 48:7 51:3,22	responsibilities	226:15 229:19	165:9	92:15 98:17
52:8 54:20 59:21	34:6 35:11	266:3	rural 199:18	103:12,18 115:19
63:13,19 64:17	responsibility	<b>rightly</b> 263:22	<b>Rutgers</b> 2:18 3:24	127:11 128:17
65:1,7,15,21 69:5	109:12 114:19	<b>rights</b> 174:14,18	22:1 23:3,5	136:2 146:7 151:5
75:10 92:16 105:8	233:8	222:7		152:6,10,13 153:8
110:8 113:11	responsible 10:5	<b>rigid</b> 49:18	<u>S</u>	156:4,9 157:7
114:2,5,9 116:5	36:3,5 118:8	rigorous 64:5	sadly 68:21	158:9,10 159:12
121:19,21 122:8	responsive 185:14	117:14 208:14	sake 30:22 31:9	159:13 172:14,18

	1		1	
173:5,10 180:8	192:12	219:3,20 227:19	self-reflection	234:4 255:10
182:5,7,14 183:12	School-level 35:11	228:1,3,19,22	180:4	264:2 265:3,22
184:16,22 193:1	science 97:17	seconds 41:10	seminar 205:20	<b>serving</b> 31:3 72:13
199:5 200:12,13	103:15 107:16	<b>Secretary</b> 2:4,6,8,9	<b>Senior</b> 2:8 65:1	139:3 143:6 199:8
200:15,16,18,19	206:7,7 228:9	3:8,19 5:9,22 9:6	154:1	session 5:2 22:9
200:21,22 201:2	<b>Sciences</b> 24:1 44:1	9:13 22:13 138:10	sense 70:5,18 74:10	124:9 135:17
201:14 202:20,22	47:15	154:1	74:16 80:16 81:6	149:20 268:2,6
203:20 216:9	scientific 259:6	<b>section</b> 51:21 68:14	88:9 98:12 109:11	sessions 117:21
219:15,15 220:8	Scientists 65:11	244:16	134:5 237:6	135:19 188:20
220:13,22 221:1,9	scope 78:18 193:17	sector 108:7	244:19	set 20:17 44:22
221:19 222:2	score 94:20 95:3,7	sectors 246:11	sensitivities 131:5	55:16 143:20
223:10,10,11	scores 71:22 73:6	<b>SEDL</b> 152:3	<b>sensory</b> 190:20	149:6 194:5
224:9,12 228:6	76:7 94:18 98:18	see 21:3 25:5 30:12	sent 77:18	setaside 256:21
229:5 230:11	98:22 99:1	32:15,19 33:2	sentiments 192:6	<b>setting</b> 18:21 49:15
232:10,12 233:6	<b>scoring</b> 206:11	40:10 45:17 49:10	separate 55:13	49:15,16 76:9
233:11,13,17,17	screen 55:21 149:8	56:15 60:9 68:14	170:22 182:11	129:7 134:21
233:22 235:1	178:18 258:20	68:16 70:1,17,21	215:1	181:16 245:6
249:11,16,18,18	screened 244:4	76:13 80:2 82:13	September 152:2	<b>settings</b> 24:11 69:2
250:7,9,19 251:2	<b>screening</b> 16:4 30:9	85:15 90:1,5,7,13	sequence 169:2	72:13 75:8 87:22
251:19,21,22	145:13 241:7	90:18 92:6 94:16	serious 35:13,13	128:11 129:10
252:5,15,17,19,20	243:22 244:1	95:5 104:17 105:5	51:7 92:7 141:2	130:3 135:1,8
253:2,3,6 255:11	245:12	105:13 106:7	seriously 140:17	247:19 248:16
256:8,15 259:13	<b>SEA</b> 5:18 241:21	109:1 111:16	serve 13:19 31:9	251:13 252:11
265:20	242:2 252:6,21	126:18 131:2	85:18 114:13	setting-level 88:5
schooling 164:1,2	254:8	149:7 164:21	140:10 153:21	seven 237:10,16
schools 2:22 6:10	seamless 218:14	168:7,17 170:5	184:21 217:11	238:2 260:6
49:13 59:11 65:9	searches 56:18	186:1 190:6 196:3	233:12 235:4,19	seventh 71:3
66:5,20 92:18	<b>SEAs</b> 15:13 255:22	205:14 207:1	248:10 253:4	severe 153:2
114:13,21 116:11	256:18	210:6	served 9:21 10:2	<b>shapes</b> 199:13
116:19 118:4,10	seated 19:7	<b>seeing</b> 130:15	31:9 42:11 43:19	<b>share</b> 41:16 42:8
118:22 119:21	second 28:1 55:11	seen 53:21 57:1	67:18 116:1	192:13 201:11
120:4 129:4	68:7 70:6 80:11	94:13 164:14	138:17,20 151:20	204:3 205:3
138:15,16,22	103:7 109:14	223:17	152:9 153:12	208:20 209:17
152:18 178:16	119:19 128:15	<b>segued</b> 226:13	217:6,10 237:6	266:12
181:8 182:10	134:12 135:16	<b>select</b> 116:8 118:11	serves 9:12 23:22	<b>shared</b> 28:11,12
183:10,14,16,20	143:12 156:8	162:2 170:16	152:15 236:12	40:18 42:17
184:6,8 188:14	172:8 173:7 177:6	242:14 244:1	service 77:20 82:11	109:11 127:18
190:13 191:16,19	197:19 233:5	<b>selected</b> 10:8 33:10	82:12 153:16	192:17 194:2
197:22 200:6	235:18 236:18	217:9 242:20	165:1 239:7	233:10 255:18
201:16 202:21,22	239:14 241:8	253:3	247:17,20 248:22	sharing 175:10
203:3 219:20	259:19	selecting 79:3	249:4 250:4,18	209:19 226:11
223:9 232:5	<b>secondary</b> 2:3,5,7,9	selection 40:18	251:10 259:14	266:4
235:17	3:4,8,12,20 4:22	242:12	265:19	Sharon 4:18
schoolwide 54:9	5:6,10,15,23 8:18	Self-Determinati	<b>services</b> 16:1 66:1	120:15
61:16	9:6,15 22:14	247:12	67:20 81:9 87:14	sharp-edged 97:3
school-age 235:12	26:22 137:15	self-evaluate	145:10 180:7	<b>Shaw</b> 23:20
school-based	138:12 142:4	104:20	183:14 211:5	<b>shelters</b> 237:19

shift 88:2,2	73:17 78:19	232:3,19 233:19	130:1 209:13	specialists 114:8
shifted 219:16	simply 57:3 61:8	240:3 241:15	220:6 225:2	184:16
<b>shifting</b> 66:14	simultaneously	244:2 247:15	sorts 58:15 62:18	specialization
<b>short</b> 19:5 147:19	170:20 193:10	248:12 251:3,6	84:21	85:14
148:4 238:15	singing 266:20	265:21 266:7,8,19	soul 41:18	specialized 40:8,17
shortchange 57:19	single 197:21,22	skills-based 82:14	sound 151:3 154:22	85:17 233:3
shortchanged	sister 238:18	Slack 2:17 6:6	157:3 169:18,19	specializing 11:3
45:10	sit 204:4,16 238:7	151:8,8,18,20	230:6 258:18	specialty 56:15
shortcut 98:20	site 152:12 187:22	152:2,8 175:2	sounds 87:8 229:10	<b>specific</b> 56:10 95:2
shortly 147:17	200:17	210:16 212:9	source 204:18	143:5 160:1,19
short-term 78:20	sites 63:12 114:14	216:12 222:19	South 152:22 153:5	169:18 180:16
160:14 243:1	200:12,18,21	225:14	<b>Southern</b> 10:1 11:2	191:7,9 196:9
show 38:7 47:3	223:22	slide 164:22 196:9	southwest 214:3	197:4 200:22
51:3 58:7 59:3,10	site-level 86:13	slides 164:13 183:6	space 81:3	207:18 212:9
69:18 71:2 73:13	sits 200:19 204:15	slightly 100:2	spaces 81:1	specifically 36:20
132:15 166:22	204:17	slim 58:8	span 178:21 210:3	61:19 113:18
167:3,10 168:8	situation 207:15	slow 78:11	248:5	131:6 154:13
196:8 236:22	six 16:22 116:2	<b>slump</b> 100:14	speak 95:16 102:12	196:16 241:19,21
239:11 260:4	129:12 146:6	small 14:1,14,18	113:15,18 212:8	245:10 246:22
showed 19:18 74:6	210:22 212:6	38:19 67:22 93:6	212:12 215:18	specified 205:22
266:3	266:18	143:13 203:17	230:13 231:4	specify 125:14
<b>showing</b> 130:10,20	sixth 121:3 203:21	241:9 244:5,6	233:5 262:10	spectrum 115:19
196:6 237:12	size 117:7	245:15	263:8 265:7	181:22
259:8	sizes 59:10 199:13	smaller 81:1 97:9	speaker 22:21 70:5	speculation 96:2
<b>shown</b> 110:9	<b>skill</b> 51:16 166:14	103:6	102:4 180:11	speech/language
170:21 176:14	166:16 167:17	smart 44:12	231:16	184:14
245:9	168:21,22 170:16	smooth 216:10	speakers 4:10 6:12	<b>speed</b> 97:20
shows 44:12 50:22	179:10 220:2	social 103:15 206:7	7:13 19:9 21:9	spend 48:16 50:12
122:8 155:8	skilled 45:5,6,18	Socratic 205:20	73:16 124:2	50:18 53:8 55:1
232:11	46:5 116:15	solid 156:2 221:17	135:21 148:1	66:13 260:8
Shriver 66:2	160:21 161:8	solutions 257:14	149:12 153:20	spending 47:18
siblings 125:11	170:4	<b>solve</b> 264:16	231:7,15 265:6	<b>Spitz</b> 1:21 2:2 3:2
<b>side</b> 134:10	skills 45:2 51:5,7,9	somebody 100:8	speaking 83:1	3:10 4:21 5:5,14
<b>sight</b> 170:1 258:19	51:10,13 57:17,18	136:15	178:1 202:11	8:3,15 13:2 99:13
<b>signed</b> 19:10 231:7	70:1 71:8 74:2	somebody's 92:6	212:12 261:12	124:1,10 125:1
231:9	80:10 81:10 82:12	somewhat 13:7	<b>special</b> 26:14 66:8	135:10 137:3
significant 75:18	83:7,19 84:5	soon 165:1 187:20	75:21 86:1 104:1	142:8 153:21
84:10 167:8	88:19 103:17,21	sophisticated 75:19	131:17 150:5,10	215:17 267:10
254:11 256:19	109:15 110:8,13	76:1 92:20	150:15 173:12,14	<b>spoken</b> 179:8
<b>signing</b> 117:20	110:15 115:14	sophistication	227:11,13,15,18	258:18
<b>signs</b> 21:3	151:16 156:13	48:20	227:21 228:3,10	sports 250:2
Silicon 45:8	157:7,9 163:5	<b>sort</b> 11:19 12:21	228:14 247:4	spread 259:14
silos 111:8 204:14	167:16 168:3	20:9 39:13 45:4	263:19,20	<b>spring</b> 15:12 145:3
<b>silver</b> 208:1	170:4,19 171:14	48:10 54:4 76:13	specialist 23:8	SRCL 182:20
similar 42:22	172:3 178:2 188:7	77:5 81:14 88:9	85:14 114:2	216:20 217:7
193:22 229:16	219:9,22 220:10	90:3,6 97:3,13	139:20 152:9	232:7 234:8
similarly 72:17	221:12 225:8	99:17 123:20	184:19	<b>SRCL's</b> 234:1

			]	1
<b>SRI</b> 7:17 262:6,12	96:1 101:22	239:15,16,16,21	126:18	181:10 248:2
<b>staff</b> 19:6 20:14	126:20 134:15	242:10 247:7,20	status 80:8	255:3
22:15 40:10,17	<b>starting</b> 8:8 87:9	248:2 249:2	<b>statute</b> 16:15 146:8	streamlining
61:2 104:22 149:3	156:7,8 222:21	252:20 253:14	<b>statutory</b> 14:8 16:8	191:21
184:16 237:3	240:21	254:4,11 255:5	16:11 17:10	<b>street</b> 1:20 237:19
238:22 251:5	startling 126:17	256:1,2,21 257:3	142:14 234:7	strengthen 235:16
252:3	starts 27:9 29:6	258:8 260:3	256:11 263:22	<b>strengths</b> 121:9,12
<b>stage</b> 18:21 147:21	84:19 200:16	264:14,20	<b>stay</b> 8:11 126:18	166:7
220:14	201:6,12 236:17	statement 136:13	222:14 230:15	Strickland 2:18
<b>stages</b> 49:13	<b>Start's</b> 72:6	148:8 252:21	steeped 99:7	3:23 21:20 22:22
staggered 62:16	state 1:4 2:4,18	257:20	Steering 42:11	23:1 24:17,18
stakes 98:14	3:24 5:10,22 6:15	statements 267:22	step 162:8 164:4	42:5 64:10 90:9
stand 53:18	9:16 14:20,21,22	states 14:4,4,14,15	166:6,12 211:21	93:20 94:5 95:15
standardized 166:8	15:13 16:17 17:16	14:17,19 15:6,6	253:20	98:13 125:21
213:4	20:12 22:1 23:6	15:15,17,19 16:13	stepchild 62:1	130:8 133:1
standards 28:11	24:15 26:3 32:2	17:3,5,21 18:13	Stephen 50:20	strict 63:18 207:3
34:22 37:1,10	33:2,10,13,14,14	19:22 42:12 50:1	steps 123:20 190:4	<b>striving</b> 1:3 5:13
42:19 43:5 45:13	42:18 43:1 58:16	58:15 63:7 65:13	190:8 212:20	12:20 13:17 26:5
56:12 79:14 82:18	79:14 87:11 88:8	88:12 90:5 112:17	239:1	29:22 44:20 46:22
83:1 85:4 91:11	90:10 92:9,10	121:18 123:14	stop 41:21 158:17	47:21 50:10 66:17
92:1,4 94:9 177:6	93:12 102:18	131:3 134:22	163:8 167:14	67:14 76:21 79:5
177:8,13 188:4,7	106:3 107:12	142:21 143:7,14	174:4	90:19 92:11 98:11
188:10,14,18,22	111:2 119:7 121:1	143:15,22,22	stories 92:16	131:14 137:17
189:5,7,9 205:12	121:10 123:8	144:3,7,10,19,19	story 172:7 232:22	140:14 142:5,14
206:1,14,21 210:9	125:16 129:16	145:2,6,19 146:11	238:14	151:14 207:1,5
210:9 211:8,9,11	130:6 132:5	146:21 147:4	storytime 238:19	210:1 232:1 240:1
211:15,17,17,18	135:22 138:10	148:13 172:5	265:18	246:13 252:22
211:21,22 255:16	139:18 144:4,5	173:17 181:5	storytimes 236:5	253:10 254:19
256:1,4,5,14	145:20 146:2	186:6 195:15	236:15 266:15	255:21 256:9,14
263:14	149:1 152:5	198:12 209:5	strategic 30:19,21	256:20 257:11,15
<b>Stanford</b> 2:13 4:4	175:13 176:8	225:4 235:21	50:7 93:22	258:8 262:13
21:18 42:10	177:7 180:18	242:3,12 243:2,5	strategically 46:19	<b>strong</b> 39:1 45:12
staple 265:21	181:1,7,9 182:20	249:13 250:13	121:8	45:15 48:5 103:8
start 8:5 12:17	183:3,11,12	252:6 253:14	strategies 40:3,5	106:13 112:6
21:14 22:10,20	192:22 194:15	255:1,6 256:4,8	60:14 65:18 74:8	121:15 176:16
44:15,21 49:9	195:1,5,14,20	257:2 260:2	74:11,17,21 75:3	180:21 181:18
67:4 69:15 70:17	196:1,10,12,17,18	262:20 263:15	80:18 106:6,7	185:4 217:4
88:4 102:3 149:12	197:6,15 198:4	264:3	111:1,11 116:16	237:21 248:6
166:22 168:12	199:2,4,8,12,22	statewide 86:20	152:7 159:15,17	stronger 226:16
175:10 176:15	201:7 203:3,16	88:10 162:19	166:1 167:15	strongly 121:7
201:21 204:6	207:21 209:3	175:6 181:6 184:3	170:2 172:3	233:20
212:17 213:2	210:19 213:17	267:9	190:16 220:10	structure 169:18
221:14 224:2,3	214:1,3 217:2,8	state's 151:12,21	242:8,8,20 245:21	195:6,11 200:1
230:4 231:2,7	217:11 223:7,11	213:22	248:4 250:16	254:15
232:12 255:8	225:11,21 226:10	stating 117:21	251:8 256:17	structured 127:21
started 14:19 20:20	229:21 234:10	<b>station</b> 236:14	strategy 166:13	196:9 213:16
57:16 70:3 83:12	235:6,18 239:14	statistics 57:1	167:20,22 169:1	structures 158:21
	,		ĺ	
			I	•

	 I	 I	 I	I
159:3 196:17	141:18 144:14,15	146:11 243:6	92:3 178:15	78:20 79:9 84:3,4
213:1	145:14 150:21	subgroups 131:16	208:16 262:22	174:15 195:3
struggle 133:19	151:1,5,16 153:3	<b>subject</b> 256:10	summer 80:1,4,5	196:9 198:13
135:8 174:19	154:14 162:13	<b>submit</b> 102:1	145:3 173:5 191:3	239:7
struggled 172:10	163:3 164:16	108:17 136:13	250:12	sure 32:12 34:1
strugglers 87:1	167:6,14 170:19	246:12 252:21	Superintendent	49:20 50:4 55:10
struggling 29:14	171:2 173:14	267:22,22	2:19 6:9 9:21	57:4 78:11 90:10
36:7,15 39:14	174:7 179:7	submitted 136:15	10:10 138:15,18	96:7,9 133:11
73:18 79:1,13,18	180:20 184:4,5	subpopulations	138:19,21 139:7	134:11 154:16
81:11 82:14 93:4	189:22 190:1	69:3	152:16 153:12	155:21 156:1,5
133:12 134:6,8	191:4 196:4 199:9	subsample 74:5	Superintendents	157:2,6 158:8,12
172:19 173:6	201:19 202:3,4	subsequently 114:3	139:15	159:14 161:12
219:21 220:9	206:8 207:11	substantial 175:21	supervision 24:13	162:4 165:7 166:3
247:18 248:11,13	212:17,21,22	suburban 199:18	41:1 139:21	167:13 168:2
<b>Stuart</b> 4:12 102:6	220:9,13 224:10	succeed 162:6	supervisors 218:7	169:20 170:11
<b>student</b> 20:2 52:3,6	224:13 226:1	succeeding 53:1	<b>supplant</b> 36:13,16	171:16 202:17
52:20 76:2 105:10	227:15,22 228:12	success 58:3 62:6	supplemental	203:5 210:18
105:14 106:4	228:21,22 229:3	89:3 110:10 111:3	58:10 78:20 79:9	219:4,17 220:11
148:15 153:14	232:16 233:7,15	118:7,9,12 155:17	204:19 222:17	220:17 221:8
166:14,18 167:17	244:20 251:15	159:20 166:21	supplementing	222:5 224:19
167:21 168:13,18	256:6	215:10 223:3,17	222:11	225:11 231:5
176:15 177:22	student's 165:21	232:6 242:18,22	<b>support</b> 5:18 15:9	240:8 252:9
178:9 180:3	166:7 193:19	257:11,14	28:2 34:21 35:17	261:16
183:21 184:10	<b>studies</b> 58:7 59:9	successful 50:2,10	36:16,18 37:12	surname 134:2
185:10 193:8,9	65:16 69:8 103:15	57:10 58:6 108:9	50:5,9 65:7 73:3	surpass 71:6
194:9 196:11	115:8 239:11	121:5 182:19	88:21 103:16	surpassed 70:10
197:22 199:15	260:4	233:9 240:21	105:16 115:11	survey 185:15,21
201:22 202:2	<b>study</b> 43:7 60:8	successfully 247:2	129:19 141:3	186:3,4,9,10
204:6 207:12	69:12 72:16,20	259:18	152:4 167:8 172:6	187:7,19 188:2
228:6 254:6	74:4,5 75:10,22	succinct 103:5	172:21 173:3,8,17	233:14
students 10:2 12:13	82:4,21 91:17	suffer 50:14	173:19 174:1	survival 84:13
15:4,5 29:15	105:8,10 114:6,15	sufficient 77:10	178:12 180:7	Susan 44:5
43:10 46:18 47:12	114:20 115:15	suggest 51:4 63:10	183:5,9,18 184:17	suspect 56:12
49:9,11,14 50:6	studying 82:6	81:20 116:20	188:3,17 189:17	sustain 204:22
50:11,13,17 52:22	114:22 180:2	126:8 132:21	190:15 195:4	sustainability 34:7
53:19 55:19 56:6	stuff 122:12	suggested 186:21	196:17 200:5,11	35:12 102:21
56:17,21 64:19	Subcommittee	suggesting 122:16	208:4,6 235:16	112:14 176:10,18
68:4 72:11,12	26:21	suggestion 62:14	241:22 242:3	176:21 177:3,5
74:1 76:15 80:7	<b>subgrant</b> 15:20	suggestions 54:20	244:13 252:22	203:14 243:21
87:5,5 89:18	121:1	suggests 71:12	253:14 254:5,8	sustainable 34:17
95:20 96:12 97:8	<b>subgrantees</b> 90:11	sum 99:17	supported 52:3	118:4
98:3 103:1,20	109:4,17 112:1,17	summarize 121:19	65:21	sustained 107:9
106:8,20 107:6	242:5,13 243:8,13	121:22	<b>supporting</b> 198:16 249:5	sustaining 112:12 176:12 190:11
115:2,13,21 118:7	243:22 244:6,10	summarized		
123:3 131:10	245:20 248:3	186:16,18 261:21	<b>supportive</b> 61:3 265:11	synergy 9:1 37:17
132:14 134:7,17 136:3 138:17	249:14 250:14	summary 57:21 summative 91:13		39:9 138:3
130.3 136.1/	subgrants 145:8,9	summative 91.13	supports 77:9	synonymously
	l	l	l	l

185:1	77:4 78:13 98:20	talks 146:16	teachers 23:14 28:4	116:2 151:21
synthesis 122:8			29:19 32:5 36:21	
•	101:9 121:11	Tampa 152:18		184:22 185:1
synthesizing 43:9	125:7 134:5	tangible 194:5	38:7 39:2 44:6	200:10,11,21
<b>system</b> 72:7 85:17 90:6,7 92:20	135:12 140:16 141:1 171:4 175:7	tap 112:9 197:18 tapping 128:8	48:11,14 52:15 53:14 54:1,2,6	217:9,11 teams 14:20,21
99:19 108:1 110:7	189:14 210:4	196:1	61:14 75:16 100:9	117:17 139:4
152:11 178:4	211:21 227:4,17		104:2,14,15,17,20	144:4,5,6 147:6
184:4 189:17	230:22 234:4	target 178:19 183:9 targeted 16:5 29:9	104.2,14,13,17,20	176:10 200:20
191:14 193:6	238:20 249:2	95:1 108:13 111:1	105.4,8,12 106.1	253:15,17 265:9
198:10 208:11	263:11,12 267:20	113:5 145:13	110:11,21 114:19	technical 2:4 5:10
211:7 223:9,17,20	taken 24:21		115:1,4,9,12,17	5:22 16:19 104:2
224:4 240:14,19	takes 118:3 134:8	183:11,15 241:4 242:8 244:21	115:1,4,9,12,17	138:11 140:21
243:17 249:11,16	talented 131:3,9,18		116:12,18 117:3	183:4 204:18
250:19		targeting 109:15 183:18	117:13,14,17	256:22 262:20
systematic 34:11	132:2,12,15 talk 15:22 27:2	targets 44:22 47:7	117.13,14,17	techniques 55:17
195:20 196:2	29:5 32:18 37:20	47:11	120:10 123:4	96:22 97:5 110:2
systematically	41:16 51:18 55:3	task 25:7 45:19	120:10 123:4	243:4
128:4 170:18	66:18 74:7 77:5	206:5,12,18	133:16 134:7	technologies 94:12
194:5	80:2,17 81:6,14	216:18 217:5,6,10	171:19 177:12,22	95:5
systemized 169:1	83:10,13 84:15	tasked 63:6	178:8 180:14,21	technology 30:19
systems 67:20	87:20 98:3 99:13	tasks 177:14	182:16 183:2	30:21,22 31:4,5,7
88:16 116:12	99:15,19 127:7	taste 56:14	184:5 185:5,7,9	41:6 46:18 55:7
142:21 183:21	130:1,1,2,15	taught 104:21	185:20 186:9,13	56:7,8,13 64:6
184:9 204:11	130:1,1,2,13	115:2,10 153:2	188:17,20 189:5	91:20 93:21,22
245:11 247:20	142:12,17 143:18	166:2,5 167:6	190:6 191:9 195:5	96:5 97:12,16
249:8 252:5	154:11 160:4	168:4,19	196:4 201:8 219:6	98:7 104:10,10
254:15 262:22	175:18 183:6	teach 40:5 48:14	219:7,19 220:22	109:21 190:17,18
systemwide 54:10	187:14 194:13,19	49:4 53:15 58:3,5	220:22 221:1,2,9	204:11,17 208:6
S-E-S-S-I-O-N	196:16 198:17	105:9 109:19,19	226:1,2,3,6 228:1	204.11,17 208.0
137:1	215:21 216:4	114:19 127:8	228:12,19 229:14	technology-based
<b>S.W</b> 1:20	227:7 229:12	158:18 159:1	230:2,5,8,13	94:8 222:18
5.77 1.20	241:21	168:3,22 169:8,12	242:17 243:15	technology-savvy
T	talked 27:5 38:9	169:12,22 174:20	245:2,11	194:12
<b>T</b> 236:10	41:5 61:14 89:18	188:21 214:13	teaching 29:8	teenagers 249:18
table 8:14 9:1	90:1 93:21 94:22	221:5,10 222:1	48:21,22 56:17	250:22
19:14 101:15	95:1 146:19	245:7 266:18	57:6 61:2 90:22	teens 249:21 250:8
136:7,16 138:3	203:13 207:4	teacher 23:7,13	100:17 106:13	television 258:15
264:16	208:18 224:22	24:2 49:4 52:14	107:15 151:1	258:16,22 259:21
tabs 21:1	talking 29:11 37:4	76:9 91:1 98:17	153:1 159:15	260:2,5,9,11,15
tacking 39:18	37:6,18 39:3,4	99:6 114:12,17	164:16 165:5	261:4,9,15
tack-on 31:11	40:13 55:1 73:21	134:9 139:2	167:1,3 168:13,16	tell 38:8 108:3
37:15	74:11 77:19 80:19	152:10 166:9	168:17 169:4	122:1 129:1 172:7
Taggart 258:5	81:2,16 88:18	167:8 172:14	189:2 193:7 195:1	194:11 197:18
tailored 112:19	93:3 99:20 135:1	180:19 181:1	207:17 222:11	236:9
191:10 199:2	136:3 144:1	184:10,18 191:6	226:7 228:6,21	telling 130:20
take 12:18 36:13	172:16 212:22	225:5,16,20,22	229:4 242:20	tells 59:22
51:13 52:18 72:16	266:20	226:16 227:9	team 33:14 43:4	template 206:4,4
				<b>1</b>
	Į	Į	I .	<u>I</u>

206:12,14,18	192:1,8 208:19	23:4 25:3,7,17	225:10 245:5	148:17 149:7,9,11
tend 81:9 222:16	209:7,10,18	26:16 27:13 28:21	third 86:21 109:20	149:12,13 154:3
tendency 79:12	230:20 231:17	28:22 31:8,15,17	111:16 131:10	166:20 172:11
term 109:13 179:22	235:2 240:10,15	31:19,22 33:17	199:7 236:19	186:20 187:7
terms 18:1 27:14	252:12 257:19	34:2 35:9 36:22	thirdly 122:9	190:21 209:15
30:6 32:6 39:6,9	262:3,9 264:22	41:19 48:17 51:5	thought 57:18	224:11 230:15,21
40:9 47:4 48:21	267:11,13,14	53:9 57:13 58:22	103:3 124:15	251:21
49:20 56:5 67:14	268:7,10	60:11 62:2 66:16	161:10 165:16	timed 107:3
75:6 94:12 96:12	thanks 112:22	67:21 68:1,3,11	226:11	timeline 17:20
160:20 164:14	125:6 246:1	69:8,19 72:10,14	thoughts 101:5	146:20
169:6 185:1 187:9	<b>Thelma</b> 2:6 3:7,19	74:21 75:14 76:21	208:20	timely 110:18
187:10 213:22	9:4	77:5 78:7,17 79:7	thousands 75:10	178:7 185:14
227:9	thematic 85:1	79:20 80:1,20,22	260:7	253:22
terribly 91:1	theme 48:18	81:9 82:5 84:19	thread 68:18	times 25:13 56:21
territory 239:16	208:12	89:12 90:9 91:22	three 10:5 22:8,16	110:17 197:20
test 79:14 90:16	themes 63:15	95:10 96:20 97:6	22:18 27:4 52:8	254:16
98:18,21,22 99:10	244:16	97:12 98:14 99:3	53:1 60:16 69:8	<b>Timothy</b> 125:19
tested 115:4,6	theoretical 57:12	99:9 100:8,22	114:12 118:2	Title 9:18 202:19
222:22	theory 89:16	102:14,17,22	120:18 162:20	202:21 204:15
testified 26:20	thickness 97:19	104:6 106:17	197:20 216:8,13	today 9:3 11:19,21
testimony 27:1	thing 32:15 44:19	121:4,13 124:18	216:15 236:15	13:16 18:6 21:15
testing 122:12	45:8 46:5 49:6,8	124:22 128:5	241:6 254:7	26:19 66:21 67:7
tests 94:17 166:8	50:3 54:14 60:19	131:19,21 133:13	three-quarters	102:16 108:15
test-taking 90:17	75:5 92:11 98:8	134:5,10 143:3,8	10:2	113:15 123:22
text 40:2 46:15	99:9 103:7 119:19	154:19 156:10,12	thrilled 25:4	133:13 136:14
55:18,18,21 56:5	128:15 132:7,19	158:2,19,21	through-grade-12	137:16 143:18
73:11,22 74:20	133:17 173:14	159:18 161:1	176:13	150:2 154:7,10
80:17 84:16	202:7 226:12	165:2,4 168:1	throws 61:5	160:3 208:9,13
100:16,17 106:21	things 8:6 9:13	171:9,10 180:11	tied 82:20 99:5	226:18 262:10
158:21 159:2	26:11 29:19 32:21	192:1,18 195:15	110:7 191:6,7	263:3 267:11,16
167:16 177:17	40:17 41:6,17	202:10 203:11	tier 173:1,4,8,21	267:19
textbooks 53:19	44:13 45:13 46:21	205:2,10 206:3	174:5	today's 64:21
texts 40:1,3,4	46:21 48:19 53:20	212:15 213:6,10	tight 20:19 149:7	232:15 268:2,6
thank 4:20 8:9 11:9	57:2,5 58:1,11,14	215:4 218:16,20	time 11:22 19:2,15	toddler 236:5
24:18,18 41:11	58:16,17 60:6	220:20 221:12,15	20:4,21 21:1,4	told 41:21
42:2,4,5 44:10	63:9 64:3 75:9	221:21 222:9	22:18 39:15,19,20	tomorrow 91:6
64:8,10 66:10,11	85:8 86:18 91:13	225:2,3 227:10	39:21 40:19 41:11	<b>tool</b> 122:11 187:19
66:12 89:6,8,10	93:2,9 96:13 98:1	228:18 244:19	47:18 48:16 50:13	187:21 197:1
89:10 93:15 101:4	102:15 118:19	268:4	50:14,15,19 51:2	198:5 244:1
101:4 102:11	126:22 127:8,9	thinking 32:3	53:8 55:1 58:12	tools 57:11 114:11
107:13,18 113:9	128:1,21 130:13	66:14 69:1 75:6	61:1 63:1 66:13	180:4 182:16
118:16,20 120:13	130:14,14 137:10	76:14 81:8,12	81:20,21,22 84:7	183:2 190:17,18
123:17,21,22	142:17 147:12	87:10,12 91:14	88:11 89:12,13	228:15
124:1 135:10,13	155:13 187:11	111:7 135:7	90:21 92:5 93:18	top 151:22 196:21
136:19 137:4	192:18 206:22	164:14 178:2	95:18 124:4,16	202:1 203:7
140:2,8 154:8	214:18 238:5,9	186:11 187:6,9	128:3 133:20	229:16
174:17,22 175:3	think 11:12 15:11	205:19 210:12	141:10 142:1	topic 25:4 133:13
L				

141:7	226:13	<b>Tye</b> 2:19 6:8	<b>unique</b> 199:17	110:1 119:22
topics 53:13 108:16	transitions 49:12	152:15,21 153:4	210:1 254:20	129:11 144:6
142:17	49:19 100:12	153:12,15 192:4	unit 206:15	145:20 147:4,7
total 90:21	translate 177:12	212:8 218:1 222:8	United 42:12 65:13	166:8 167:6,19,21
totally 70:14	translated 127:10	229:6	units 82:3 223:20	168:20 178:8
touch 77:16 78:10	translations 56:2	tying 211:14	universal 55:6,16	183:21 185:1
touchpoints 87:15	tremendous 72:22	type 17:15 105:3	89:4 109:20 208:7	195:6 213:9 227:4
tough 61:22 63:3	76:6 105:19	207:14	245:12	234:6 238:3
track 88:11 92:14	tremendously	types 29:15 158:21	universally 72:15	256:19 257:7
92:17 93:8,10	209:20	162:12 231:22	universities 63:12	259:17 260:1,2,10
183:21 184:4,10	trend 69:18 71:5	typical 70:14	226:10	260:14 261:6
227:17,19 228:3	trends 69:9	typically 191:15	University 2:13,15	useful 53:5 58:9
234:16	tried 92:17	210:19 212:3	2:18 3:24 4:4,8,19	93:16
tracking 89:17	trouble 91:9		11:2 21:18 22:2	uses 56:8
traction 78:4	100:13 133:7,19	U	23:6,16,21 42:11	<b>usually</b> 171:13
traditional 55:19	true 100:19 112:13	<b>UDL</b> 110:2	66:8 120:16	260:21
57:19	truly 25:11 99:1	<b>ultimate</b> 155:2,6	139:12,18 150:6	utilization 185:14
tragic 260:13	trust 258:4	ultimately 72:9	150:10,12,16	utilized 244:2
trail 68:18	try 64:2 81:15 91:2	88:13 154:21	152:22 153:5	utilizing 232:9
train 251:11	137:8	243:1 256:7	227:8	233:21
trained 114:10	trying 76:13 83:4	263:16 264:17	unskilled 161:1,8	UVA 227:14
235:11	221:17	umbrella 45:1	untapped 130:4	<b>U.S</b> 1:1,21 3:5,9,13
<b>trainer</b> 152:12	turn 18:16 51:17	unable 245:5	upbringing 130:16	3:21 4:23 5:8,12
<b>training</b> 41:1 109:8	54:22 93:5 104:5	underlined 30:20	<b>upfront</b> 176:18	5:17,24 67:8,17
110:4,4 114:11,12	118:3 122:20	undermines 254:17	188:1	69:13 72:6,18
114:16 152:4	142:2 147:11	underneath 190:12	uplifted 103:21	73:7,7 84:7 113:1
214:12 230:6	149:16 154:4	underscored 121:6	<b>upper</b> 219:14,19	114:7 115:8
242:16,16 243:13	turns 46:12 48:3	understand 46:6	222:2	246:19
243:14 244:20	58:2	46:15,20 116:4	upper-class 127:16	
245:10 249:22	tutor 229:2	117:3 156:22	upper-grade 28:18	<b>V</b>
250:15,15,20	<b>tutoring</b> 40:22 50:8	159:8 160:22	<b>upset</b> 90:16	<b>valid</b> 178:17
251:9 252:4	173:6	161:1,13 167:15	up-to-speed 163:4	Valley 45:8
trainings 109:2	<b>TV</b> 259:7,15	171:20,22 182:10	<b>urban</b> 2:14 4:6	<b>value</b> 258:14 259:9
train-the-trainer	260:21 261:21	188:20 189:6	22:5 64:15 65:8	259:15,21
243:20	twelve 16:22 121:3	understandably	103:5 135:3	valuing 46:11 49:5
traits 129:22	146:6 216:16	131:13	199:17	variability 133:9
trajectories 83:12	two 22:18 27:22	understanding	<b>urge</b> 239:20 242:5	133:22
transcript 149:20	47:14 48:4,5	12:21 24:8 40:19	259:19	variables 72:9
transferred 115:12	52:21 53:7 55:13	46:16 109:9	use 11:13 16:14	variation 75:18
transition 3:15	85:8 124:20,21	169:17 177:19	17:22 30:19 33:3	variety 12:10 30:16
100:19 101:2	143:1 172:21	187:16 218:14	34:4 39:22 40:19	31:15 141:16
109:4 110:22	173:2,8 185:22	understands 55:11	46:18 56:19 63:8	142:16
163:22 188:4	235:8 251:16	undoubtedly	75:19 94:2 95:19	various 33:18
216:7,10 217:21	259:2	255:12	97:15 98:6,21	218:8 234:3 242:9
230:16,22 247:2	two-part 14:1	uneven 132:15	103:21 104:9,20	248:7
256:1,13	<b>Two-thirds</b> 241:13	unfolding 258:20	105:2,5 106:9	VCR 51:15
transitioned	two-year 229:18	Unified 9:22	107:11 109:20	vehicle 105:11

			100.15	05 11 00 5 105 10
version 150:18	51:7,13 55:10	way 8:7 20:3 28:8	133:16	87:11 98:2 105:10
versus 221:15,16	56:6 57:22 59:18	31:1 36:20,21	went 101:19,19	105:14 106:4
vertical 218:13	60:5,22 67:13	37:11,14 56:6	136:21,22 143:21	107:9 108:7 112:4
vertically 218:5	73:13 78:10 81:6	58:11,21 60:2	231:12,12	116:3 119:17
vested 117:10	81:9 82:16,18	61:7,8,14 62:5	weren't 122:14	127:14 128:7
<b>vibrate</b> 21:7 149:16	86:8,17 87:20	70:22 81:7 88:1	West 72:19	129:3,8 132:17
videoclips 97:20	93:15 95:22 96:3	92:2 95:13,18,21	<b>WETA</b> 261:15	134:7 135:2
videotape 75:11	96:13,17 100:11	96:8 97:12,19	We'll 98:21	137:22 140:18
view 28:11	102:11 107:13	100:3 103:12	we're 28:10,12,16	170:9 180:4,19
viewing 261:9	108:22 109:1	107:2 127:7,20	83:1 123:13	211:2 212:3 221:3
<b>Virginia</b> 150:6,11	118:20 119:11	135:5 141:8 143:9	166:11 219:12,12	221:4 226:6,20
214:1,3 227:9	123:19 125:7	143:12 148:16	we've 37:6	229:1 235:10,13
262:8	127:4 133:17	158:10 168:1	WGBH 261:15	235:16 236:1,2
vis 131:4	134:12 135:10,13	183:7 185:12	wide 12:9	239:5,20 240:6,18
vision 20:9 28:12	136:12 137:19	186:13 188:5	widely-used 150:19	246:5,9 247:18
148:21 175:12	140:9 141:5,8	190:2 191:17	Wikipedia 57:3	248:14 249:22
210:6	149:8 154:22	201:14 208:1	<b>William</b> 66:3	250:18,20 251:1
visit 118:22	155:21 158:8	211:15 212:5	willing 34:5	252:3 257:22
visits 238:17	162:3,19 163:18	214:16 221:14	win 16:14	263:1
visual 175:11	164:9 166:16,20	234:18 237:6	window 18:12	worked 32:11 62:8
vis-a 131:3	167:13 168:8	257:8 266:5	wins 15:18	79:1 186:12
vital 121:5 253:17	169:20,22 172:7	ways 13:19 17:4	wisely 39:19	210:20 239:9
257:22	186:8 192:8 197:2	30:16 56:20 62:21	wish 8:11 18:3	263:8,16 264:19
vocabulary 65:17	207:2,7,16,18	75:3 80:3 88:19	women 129:11	workforce 225:1,7
70:18 71:21 72:3	208:19 209:9,18	91:10,22 93:22	wonderful 50:20	225:12 230:5
76:7 81:12 82:1	210:3,11 213:11	95:1 98:5,9 99:1	107:14 198:5	246:18 248:19
82:20 158:7,11	225:1 235:10	100:3 126:6	229:11	working 62:20
170:3 177:18	262:9 268:7	130:21 132:10	wondering 94:3	91:19 95:9 160:13
179:12	wanted 8:5 13:12	143:1 177:19	word 25:12 34:7	160:18 180:16
voice 11:14 192:11	22:19 44:16 124:5	222:12,20 239:10	38:14,16 40:22	182:9 184:11
volume 44:4	124:13 130:8	weaknesses 166:8	57:7 70:16 73:2	209:5 210:16
Volumes 44:3	142:9 164:19	web 180:6	81:21 116:6	211:1 214:2,6,12
voluntary 212:14	186:7 198:19	webcast 268:9	158:12 161:2	214:19,21 215:3
256:3	wanting 61:17	<b>Weber</b> 4:13 107:19	169:22 258:19,19	215:11 220:22
volunteers 251:5	warm 40:7	107:20	259:14	226:9 229:15
251:10	warning 21:4	website 259:20	words 54:8 70:1,14	247:6
$\mathbf{W}$	Washington 1:20	261:22 268:3	70:20 71:16 73:1	works 42:22
wait 111:16 164:3	wasn't 44:12	week 131:6 236:15	80:15 170:1	251:16 259:20
165:9,15	187:20 217:4	268:5	175:14 177:20	264:13
waiting 237:18	226:8	weekend 268:11	word-level 93:2	worksheets 40:16
walk 147:13	waste 61:1 90:21	weekends 250:12	work 11:6,16 26:17	workshops 117:4
Walker 153:8	260:13	weekly 236:6	27:5 28:20 36:10	world 60:7 77:13
walker 133.8 wall 237:20	watch 105:9 260:5	weeks 126:19,19,19	39:4 40:21 50:16	81:13 86:1 96:14
want 11:18 20:21	watched 261:4	welcome 3:6 5:4	50:20 57:4 59:6	97:13
21:8 30:12 41:2	watching 258:18	11:18 18:21 140:7	59:16 60:21 73:12	world's 231:20
44:21 45:5 50:18	260:21 Watha 226:10	257:16	73:14 82:8,9,20	worried 99:5
77.21 73.3 30.10	<b>Watha</b> 236:10	well-meaning	82:22,22 84:21	worry 31:4 34:9
	l			l

40.12.52.0.20	57.9 69.22 107.7	<b>\$150 2</b> 64.10	140.5.0	252-22
49:12 52:9,20	57:8 68:22 107:7	<b>\$178</b> 264:19	<b>140</b> 5:9	253:22
53:9 133:4,11,14	111:13 116:2,17	<b>\$190</b> 253:21	<b>142</b> 5:13	<b>2011</b> 18:15
worship 237:17	118:3,3 123:15	<b>\$25</b> 203:20	<b>147</b> 5:18,20	<b>2050</b> 67:8
worth 203:20	126:16 138:21	<b>\$350,000</b> 65:6	<b>15</b> 16:20 90:22	<b>209</b> 6:11
wouldn't 122:19,19	152:8 153:3	1	111:5 121:1 146:3	<b>21st</b> 51:5,6,9,12
124:19	163:11 219:2,3	1 44:3 45:7 52:12	213:9 236:19	57:16 66:19
wrapped 106:18	225:18 232:12	59:20 63:20	<b>154</b> 6:4	232:17
write 40:15 123:1	237:10 259:8	173:21 242:7	<b>16</b> 91:1	<b>231</b> 6:12,13
199:1 204:4,12	261:20 263:18	243:8 244:18	<b>17</b> 72:1	<b>235</b> 6:15
205:11	266:1	254:10	17th 71:22	<b>24</b> 3:23 236:6
writers 29:10,11	yellow 91:21	<b>1:00</b> 135:17 136:11	<b>175</b> 6:6	<b>240</b> 6:17
36:7 90:19	yesterday 91:4	<b>1:06</b> 136:22 137:2	<b>18</b> 3:14,18	<b>246</b> 6:19
writeup 128:17	York 42:18	<b>10</b> 33:4 57:8 123:14	<b>19</b> 1:13 91:3	<b>25</b> 94:18 259:8
writing 40:16 43:4	young 24:6 27:14	236:8	<b>19th</b> 26:19 51:8	<b>25th</b> 73:6,8
45:16,17 46:2	28:2 29:3 32:7	<b>10/11</b> 203:20	57:17	<b>250</b> 198:1 200:18
50:19,22,22 51:13	65:13 77:19 84:22	<b>10:43</b> 101:19	<b>192</b> 6:8	<b>252</b> 6:21
51:15 57:6,12,20	155:22 172:8,12	<b>10:43</b> 101:19 <b>10:53</b> 101:20	<b>192,000</b> 199:9	<b>258</b> 6:23
83:22 84:1 91:15	210:14,14 238:6	<b>100</b> 93:17 116:18	<b>1981</b> 153:2	<b>262</b> 7:16
91:16 103:16	239:8 244:3 247:1	<b>102</b> 4:10,12	<b>1988</b> 150:13	<b>265</b> 7:19
105:15 106:22	247:16 252:2	<b>107</b> 4:13	<b>1990</b> 150:14 153:7	3
115:22 148:13	262:16 263:1	<b>11</b> 3:6 116:17	2	<b>3</b> 44:4 100:10,10
152:6 168:8 178:1	youth 55:8,9 65:3	220:12	<b>2</b> 44:3 121:13 173:1	103:10 173:4
179:13 188:9	174:13 246:19	11th 150:19	173:9 174:5	210:7,10,17 211:3
204:5 205:21	247:3,4,10,11,17	<b>11:27</b> 136:21	242:12 243:13	211:10,11,22
218:5 251:15	248:10,15,19	<b>11.27</b> 130.21 <b>113</b> 4:15	255:21	212:4,17,19 213:5
<b>written</b> 108:17 136:13 267:21	249:4,9,17 250:18	<b>118</b> 4:17	<b>2:42</b> 231:12	213:10 214:10
	251:2,3,9,12,17 251:20 265:2	<b>12</b> 3:16 13:20 15:3	<b>2:49</b> 231:13	242:16 256:18
written-out 13:13		48:13 99:14 103:5	<b>20</b> 24:21 68:22 91:3	<b>3:26</b> 268:13
wrong 126:9 WT 65:5,6	youth-serving 247:8	105:19 143:6	93:4,5	<b>30</b> 41:10 114:10
www.captionsfor	Yudin 2:9 22:12	144:14 178:21	<b>20th</b> 57:17	<b>31,000</b> 10:2
261:22	93:15	193:14,16 210:21	<b>200</b> 37:5	<b>33,000</b> 138:16
<b>Wynne</b> 2:19 6:8	93.13	215:20 216:4	<b>2000</b> 113:21 150:15	
152:15,15	$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$	225:3,8 227:18	<b>2001</b> 69:15 72:6	35-foot-long
132.13,13	<b>zero</b> 27:1 125:9	232:3 240:3	<b>2002</b> 64:22 153:8	237:20
<u> </u>	128:2 211:22	254:13	<b>2003</b> 10:18	<b>37</b> 114:21
year 10:10,19	212:4	<b>12th</b> 1:19 46:13	<b>2004</b> 153:10	
26:19 47:6 68:20	zero-in 224:8	67:15	<b>2005</b> 10:14 108:11	4
110:17 114:17	zero-to-pre-K	12th-graders	241:3	<b>4</b> 44:4 69:17 70:19
138:13 139:8	223:22	220:12	<b>2006</b> 64:22 261:1	211:3
140:19 197:19,21	Zimmerman 261:2	<b>12-grade</b> 222:13	<b>2007</b> 10:12 65:4	<b>4-year-olds</b> 212:14
203:20 216:17	<b>zip</b> 103:2	<b>120</b> 4:18 114:20	<b>2008</b> 23:19 139:11	212:18
230:2,4,12 241:8	<b>zoo</b> 130:13	<b>125</b> 4:9	152:2 153:12	<b>4-12</b> 24:12
253:21 260:7		<b>13</b> 3:10	<b>2009</b> 9:8 10:8 26:19	<b>4:00</b> 135:18
years 25:6,19 27:10	\$	<b>13th</b> 153:16	42:12 43:11 46:13	<b>40</b> 16:21,21 111:12
30:10 37:5 47:14	<b>\$10</b> 253:13	<b>135</b> 4:20	47:10 65:10	121:2,3 146:4,5
47:14 49:3 52:2	<b>\$150,000</b> 14:17	<b>137</b> 5:2,4,5	<b>2010</b> 1:13 69:1	<b>400</b> 67:8
	143:22	<i>y y-</i>		<b>44</b> 4:3 10:4
	l	<u> </u>	l	

			Page 306
5			
<b>5</b> 16:16 27:1 77:12			
100:10 121:2			
125:9 128:2			
145:20 163:20			
264:2,5			
<b>50</b> 76:1 115:6			
260:17			
<b>53</b> 138:16			
<b>550</b> 1:19			
<b>56</b> 199:14			
6			
<b>60-day</b> 18:12			
<b>600</b> 116:18			
<b>63,000</b> 231:22			
<b>640</b> 230:2			
66 4:5			
<b>67</b> 199:4			
7			
<b>75</b> 49:3			
8			
83:2			
<b>8-foot-high</b> 237:20			
<b>83</b> 233:14			
<b>89</b> 4:9			
094.9			
9			
<b>9:00</b> 1:20 8:6			
<b>9:09</b> 8:2			
<b>9:10</b> 8:8			
<b>90</b> 76:10 236:8,8			
<b>95</b> 145:22 264:1			
<b>95,000</b> 252:18			
<b>96,000</b> 232:5			
<b>98</b> 260:9			
	l		I

## CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Striving Readers Literacy Program

Before: US Department of Education

Date: 11-19-10

Place: Washington, DC

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Court Reporter

near Rous &